

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 100

IR 000 658

TITLE White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976. Hearing Before the Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Third Congress, First Session.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 74

NOTE 114p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS *Federal Legislation; Financial Support; Information Centers; *Information Services; Libraries; Library Cooperation; *Library Planning; Public Support

IDENTIFIERS *White House Conference Library Information Service

ABSTRACT

Hearings were held on a "Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to call a White House conference on library and information services in 1976." The purpose of the conference would be to develop recommendations for further improvement and growth of the nation's libraries and information centers in order to make information and ideas accessible; make use of new technology; encourage cooperation and coordination among libraries; and increase public support of libraries. There are supporting statements and other materials from the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the U.S., publishers, library associations and their officials, book committees, professors, educators, library trustees, a corrections board officer, authors, media specialists, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and others. (LS)

ED 092100

IR

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES IN 1976

HEARING BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.J. RES. 734 and H.J. RES. 766

JOINT RESOLUTIONS TO AUTHORIZE AND REQUEST THE
PRESIDENT TO CALL A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON
LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES IN 1976

HEARING HELD NOVEMBER 29, 1973

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1974

26-180

12 000 658

12 000 658

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMÁS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky
HERMAN BADILLO, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
JAIME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLÉNBOHN, Illinois
JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
JACK F. KEMP, New York
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
DAVID TOWELL, Nevada
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
ROBERT J. HUBER, Michigan

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMÁS, Indiana, *Chairman*

PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
ROMANO MAZZOLI, Kentucky
HERMAN BADILLO, New York
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida

EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page
Burkhardt, Frederick, Chairman, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.....	15
Harlan, John B., president, American Library Society.....	19
Hoopes, Townsend, president, Association of American Publishers.....	74
Lowrie, Jean, president, the American Library Association.....	21
Mumford, Dr. L. Quincy, Librarian of Congress.....	62
Pittenger, Jack, secretary of education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.....	6
Rhoads, Dr. James B., Archivist of the United States.....	65
Stevens, Roger L., chairman, board of trustees, National Book Committee.....	71
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.:	
Adams, Walter, president, American Association of University Professors, statement of.....	93
Aries, Leonard P., president, Coalition of Adult Education Organizations, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated November 16, 1973.....	99
Association of Research Libraries, statement of the.....	85
Bates, Henry E., Jr., executive director, Urban Library Trustees Council, statement by.....	108
Brickman, John M., executive director, New York City Board of Correction, statement by.....	109
Brown (Mrs.) Sarah C., president, Medical Library Association, Inc., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated December 5, 1973.....	102
Burkhardt, Frederick, Chairman, National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences, prepared statement of.....	15
Fisher, Miles Mark IV, executive secretary, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, statement by.....	103
Ford, Hon. William D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan, statement of.....	80
Henderson, Dr. Robert M., president, the Theater Library Association, statement by.....	107
Hitchens, Howard B., executive director, Association for Educational Communications and Technology, statement of.....	100
Karp, Irwin, counsel, the Authors League of America, statement of.....	84
Lorenz, John G., the International Federation of Library Associations, statement on behalf of.....	99
Lowrie, Jean, president, the American Library Association:	
"Basic Issues in the Governmental Financing of Public Library Services," a paper entitled.....	24
"Library Bill of Rights," a document entitled.....	23
"Southwestern Educational Library Project," a brochure entitled.....	51
Supplementary statement of.....	56
"White House Conference on Libraries Resolution," a resolution entitled.....	22
McKenna, F. E., executive director, Special Libraries Association, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated December 4, 1973.....	105
Morse, John F., director, American Council on Education, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated November 26, 1973.....	93
Norwood, Frank W., executive secretary, Joint Council on Educational Telecommunications, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated December 3, 1973.....	101
Pattie, Kenton, vice president and educational director, National Audiovisual Association, statement of.....	103

(B) representatives of educational institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations (including professional and scholarly associations for the advancement of education and research);

(C) persons with special knowledge of, and special competence with, technology as it may be used for the improvement of library and information services; and

(D) representatives of the general public.

(c) (1) The Conference shall be planned and conducted under the direction of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). All Federal departments and agencies shall cooperate with and give assistance to the Commission in order to enable it to carry out its responsibilities under this joint resolution.

(2) In administering this joint resolution, the Commission shall—

(A) when appropriate, request the cooperation and assistance of other Federal departments and agencies in order to carry out its responsibilities;

(B) make technical and financial assistance (by grant, contract, or otherwise) available to the States to enable them to organize and conduct conferences and other meetings in order to prepare for the Conference; and

(C) prepare and make available background materials for the use of delegates to the Conference and associated State conferences, and prepare and distribute such reports of the Conference as may be appropriate.

(d) A final report of the Conference, containing such findings and recommendations as may be made by the Conference, shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and twenty days following the close of the Conference. Such report shall be submitted to the Congress not later than one hundred and twenty days after the date of the adjournment of the Conference, which final report shall be made public and, within ninety days after its receipt by the President, transmitted to the Congress together with a statement of the President containing the President's recommendations with respect to such report.

(e) (1) There is hereby established an advisory committee to the Conference composed of twenty-eight members, appointed by the President, which shall advise and assist the National Commission in planning and conducting the Conference.

(2) The President is authorized to establish such other advisory and technical committees as may be necessary to assist the Conference in carrying out its functions.

(3) Members of any committee established under this subsection who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while attending to the business of the Conference, be entitled to receive compensation therefor at a rate fixed by the President but not exceeding \$100 per diem, including traveltime. Such members may, while away from their homes or regular places of business, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as may be authorized under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(f) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(g) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

[H.J. Res. 766, 93d Cong., 1st sess.]

JOINT RESOLUTION To authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976

Whereas access to information and ideas is indispensable to the development of human potential, the advancement of civilization, and the continuance of enlightened self-government; and

Whereas the preservation and dissemination of information and ideas is the primary purpose and function of libraries and information centers; and

Whereas the growth and augmentation of the Nation's libraries and information centers are essential if all Americans are to have reasonable access to adequate services of libraries and information centers; and

Whereas new achievements in technology offer a potential for enabling libraries and information centers to serve the public more fully, expeditiously, and economically; and

Whereas maximum realization of the potential inherent in the use of advanced technology by libraries and information centers requires cooperation through

planning for, and coordination of, the services of libraries and information centers; and

Whereas the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is developing plans for meeting national needs for library and information services and for coordinating activities to meet those needs; and

Whereas productive recommendations for expanding access to libraries and information services will require public understanding and support as well as that of public and private libraries and information centers: Now, therefore, be it.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the President of the United States is authorized to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

(b) (1) The purpose of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Conference") shall be to develop recommendations for the further improvement of the Nation's libraries and information centers in accordance with the policies set forth in the preamble to this joint resolution.

(2) The conference shall be composed of, and bring together—

(A) representatives of local, statewide, regional, and national institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations which provide library and information services to the public;

(B) representatives of educational institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations (including professional and scholarly associations for the advancement of education and research);

(C) persons with special knowledge of, and special competence with, technology as it may be used for the improvement of library and information services; and

(D) representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, professional and lay people, and other members of the general public.

(c) (1) The conference shall be planned and conducted under the direction of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(2) In administering this joint resolution, the Commission shall—

(A) when appropriate, request the cooperation and assistance of other Federal departments and agencies in order to carry out its responsibilities;

(B) make technical and financial assistance (by grant, contract, or otherwise) available to the States to enable them to organize and conduct conferences and other meetings in order to prepare for the Conference; and

(C) prepare and make available background materials for the use of delegates to the Conference and associated State conferences, and prepare and distribute such reports of the Conference and associated State conferences as may be appropriate.

(3) (A) Each Federal department and agency is authorized and directed to cooperate with, and provide assistance to, the Commission upon its request under clause (A) of paragraph (2); and, for that purpose, each Federal department and agency is authorized to provide personnel to the Commission in accordance with section 3341 of title 5, United States Code. For the purposes of such section 3341 and this paragraph, the Commission shall be deemed to be a part of any executive or military department of which a request is made under clause (A) of paragraph (2).

(B) The Librarian of Congress is authorized to detail personnel to the Commission, upon request, to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this joint resolution.

(4) In carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, the Commission is authorized to engage such personnel as may be necessary, without regard for the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive civil service, and without regard for chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(5) The Commission is authorized to publish and distribute for the Conference the report authorized under this joint resolution without regard for section 501 of title 44, United States Code.

(6) Members of the Conference may, while away from their homes or regular places of business and attending the Conference, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as may be allowed under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons serving without pay. Such expenses may be paid by way of advances, reimbursement, or in installments as the Commission may determine.

(d) A final report of the Conference, containing such findings and recommendations as may be made by the Conference, shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and twenty days following the close of the Conference, which final report shall be made public and, within ninety days after its receipt by the President, transmitted to the Congress together with a statement of the President containing the President's recommendations with respect to such report.

(e) (1) There is hereby established a twenty-eight member advisory committee to the Conference composed of (A) at least three members of the Commission designated by the Chairman thereof; (B) two persons designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; (C) two persons designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and (D) not more than twenty-one persons appointed by the President. Such advisory committee shall assist and advise the Commission in planning and conducting the Conference. The Chairman of the Commission shall serve as Chairman of the Conference.

(2) The Chairman of the Commission is authorized, in his discretion, to establish, prescribe functions for, and appoint members to, such advisory and technical committees as may be necessary to assist and advise the Conference in carrying out its functions.

(3) Members of any committee established under this subsection who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while attending to the business of the Conference, be entitled to receive compensation therefor at a rate fixed by the President but not exceeding \$100 per diem, including traveltime. Such members may, while away from their homes or regular places of business, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as may be authorized under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(f) The Commission shall have authority to accept, on behalf of the Conference, in the name of the United States, grants, gifts, or bequests of money for immediate disbursement by the Commission in furtherance of the Conference. Such grants, gifts, or bequests offered the Commission, shall be paid by the donor or his representative to the Treasurer of the United States, whose receipts shall be their acquittance. The Treasurer of the United States shall enter such grants, gifts, and bequests in a special account to the credit of the Commission for the purposes of this joint resolution.

(g) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(h) There are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitations such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution. Such sums shall remain available for obligation until expended.

MR. BRADEMAs. The Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor will come to order for the purpose of conducting a hearing on House Joint Resolution 766, and related bills, to authorize a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

The Chair would just observe at the outset that he was pleased to learn, while introducing House Joint Resolution 766, that Congressman Gerald Ford of Michigan had introduced a similar measure, House Joint Resolution 734.

Since that act of enlightened leadership, as we all know, Congressman Ford has been nominated, under the 25th amendment to the Constitution, for the position of the Vice President of the United States.

The Chair hopes that he will not be considered overly partisan in pointing out that if Mr. Ford is confirmed as Vice President, the library community will be assured at least one friend in the administration.

The Chair feels constrained to note that our consideration today of proposals to convene a White House Conference on Library and In-

formation Services in the year of the Bicentennial takes place in the context of the most astonishing proposals by President Nixon with respect to Federal assistance to libraries.

I speak, of course, of the President's request in the fiscal 1974 budget that we terminate all Federal aid to libraries in our schools and colleges as well as to public libraries.

Happily, both the House and the Senate have rejected this suggestion on the part of the President, and the Labor-HEW appropriations measure which is now in conference continues these important programs.

That the President could have made such a proposal, however, makes our consideration of a White House Conference on Library and Information Service all the more appropriate.

For it appears to the Chair that such a conference can help stimulate a national debate about the value of libraries and information resources in our society, and it can help, as well, define the appropriate roles of local, State, and Federal Governments in the support of these precious national resources.

The Chair is particularly pleased that we have with us today the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor, who, throughout his service in Congress has been a vigorous champion of libraries and I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Perkins, for such comments as he wishes to make.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me compliment our distinguished chairman, Congressman Brademas, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, the subcommittee having jurisdiction over library legislation.

All of you can be very proud that you have a great friend chairing this subcommittee who has always protected your interests and will continue to protect your interests in the future.

I share the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Brademas, that there was nothing in the budget from the White House this year for libraries. This was very disturbing, but the Congress did not stand by and let the special message of the President on education be enacted in any form.

In fact, the Congress has totally rejected these recommendations of the President.

I am thankful, Mr. Chairman, that you have called up the White House proposal. The White House conference can serve a useful purpose, especially in times like these when, after libraries have made much progress in past years, proposals are pending to do away with categorical programs and go to a general plan—where the money will go to the State level without being earmarked. These proposals can be thoroughly explored through your White House conference.

Every time a distinguished group of educators—librarians like yourself—get together in a White House conference and sit down at a table and discuss problems and concerns of librarians, I know that something good will come out of it.

More than anything else, you are going to mold a lot of public sentiment in your favor and you are going to help educate a group of people who are not familiar with these concerns and problems. I am sure that sound proposals will come from a conference of this kind because of the legislation Mr. Brademas has introduced. I

endorse wholeheartedly the Brademas proposal and I know it will be enacted.

In closing, the real reason I came before this distinguished group this morning—Mr. Brademas invited me yesterday—was to compliment all of you for the good work you have done in the past and your interest.

Since you are here today representing States throughout America for the advancement of libraries, you are here for a most worthy cause and I want to tip my hat to all of you and say "best wishes." You are in good hands under the leadership of John Brademas.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for those very gracious remarks.

The Chair does want to extend a particular welcome to the State librarians from all over the United States, who are here today and to say how glad we are to have them and indeed persons who may not fill that particular responsibility but who are concerned with libraries.

We are pleased to have with us today:

Dr. John C. Pittenger, secretary of education for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science;

John B. Harlan, president of the American Library Society, South Bend, Ind.;

Jean E. Lowrie, president of the American Library Association;

The Honorable L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress;

Dr. James B. Rhoads, U.S. Archivist;

Roger Stevens, chairman, National Book Committee; and

Dr. Townsend Hoopes, president of the Association of American Publishers.

Our first witness this morning is an old and good friend of the Chair's, and I am pleased to introduce at this time Jack Pittenger, secretary of education for the State of Pennsylvania.

The Chair would like to say at the outset to the witnesses that in that there are several witnesses, we want to hear all of you and you have been kind enough to prepare statements.

If it is possible for you to summarize your statements, they will be included in their entirety in the printed transcript and that process will afford us an opportunity to put more questions to you.

STATEMENT OF JACK PITTENGER, SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. PITTENGER. Thank you very much.

I appreciate that invitation, particularly because I was going to ask your permission to do that if you had not given it to me first.

I will submit my prepared statement for the record and summarize my remarks.

[Statement referred to follows:]

TESTIMONY OF JOHN C. PITTENGER, SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, honored guests, I am John C. Pittenger, Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It is a privilege to appear before you today as a representative of the Commonwealth

of Pennsylvania and the Council of Chief State School Officers. The Council is composed of the chief education officer in each of the fifty states. I am here to speak in support of the proposal for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976 as provided for in H. J. Resolutions Numbers 734 and 736.

The Council believes that this Conference will focus attention in a positive way on the increasingly important role that libraries and information services are playing in our democratic society. Thomas Jefferson stated education is "the most legitimate engine of government."¹ The corollary to this has been frequently expressed by the national leaders who have identified libraries and information resource centers as the heart of education.

THE USERS OF LIBRARIES

Libraries of all types, public, school, academic and special, long considered the domain of students and intellectuals, have moved to the foreground as a prime national knowledge resource. No longer literary morgues, they are on the firing line in the struggle to maintain and advance our civilization. Education is not confined to the hours and days a person spends in a classroom wherever that classroom may be, in an elementary or secondary school, college or university, or vocational training institution. Informational needs begin in the local community where persons of varying occupations, ages, social status, education and interests live and work. They rely on information from many sources and in many forms and they all go to the library. And now, the traditional library of printed materials, important as such materials are, no longer suffices. New media and new techniques for transferring information are continually developing. Tape cassettes, video cassettes, two-way cable television, facsimile transmission of texts and pictures, storage of information in a variety of microforms and production of readable copy from the microform on demand are all part of the contemporary library program. Storage and retrieval of information for the housewife, farmer, urban tenant, student, business man, retired person, manufacturer or whomever, is essential in every community for our continued advancement.

Special groups—the aged, the blind and handicapped and confined in institutions like hospitals, nursing homes and prisons need information and life enrichment materials that libraries provide. Accurate information on subjects of national concern such as protection of the environment and legislative proposals must be available in a variety of forms so that every citizen can have access to it.

Non-traditional and continuing education programs are reaching out to give new opportunities for learning to persons who find classroom education out of reach or inappropriate. Pennsylvania is taking steps to make the open college a reality for everyone in the state.

The application of computer and other electronic technologies in the storage, retrieval and transmission of information is a significant development for which we must have regional and national planning. In a 1972 report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education this development is referred to as "The Fourth Revolution." The report bearing that title says that:

... by the year 2000 it now appears that a significant portion of instruction in higher education on campus may be carried on through informational technology—perhaps in a range of 10 to 20 percent. It certainly will penetrate much further than this into off-campus instruction at levels beyond the secondary school—in fact it may become dominant there at a level of 80 percent or more.

Better than ever before, it can bring education to the sick, the handicapped, the aged, the prisoners, the members of the armed forces, persons in remote areas, and to many adults who could attend classes on campus but who will find instruction at home more convenient. It can create new uses for leisure time, can improve community participation by imparting greater skill and knowledge to citizens. Informational technology is already heavily used in the armed forces and in in-plant training in industry. It is now more widely used in primary and secondary schools than in on-campus higher education and will continue to be used more at those levels in the future.²

¹ Jefferson, T. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. by Albert Ellery Beigh. Washington, D.C. Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907. Vol. 6, p. 392.

² Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *The Fourth Revolution; Instructional Technology in Higher Education*. New York. McGraw-Hill, 1972.

THE NEED FOR COOPERATION

Obviously the cost of developing and maintaining library resource centers is great no matter on what level or with what organization they may be associated.

Information sources in a given community need to be coordinated to reduce overlap and duplication of materials and effort and to provide combined resources that are greater in range and depth than those of a single unit. For the community's well being, the resources should be available to all. Public libraries, school libraries, community college libraries, college and university libraries and a variety of special interest libraries may all be serving different population segments of the same community. Ways must be found to tie these resources together, not necessarily in combined libraries, but certainly in coordinated and cooperatively planned library units.

In Pennsylvania nineteen cooperatives have already been developed, involving all kinds of libraries. Some of these are the *Committee on Cooperation of the Union Library Catalog* in the Philadelphia area, the *Pittsburgh Regional Library Center* in the western part of the state and the *Eastern Pennsylvania Interlibrary Cooperative* in the southeastern area.

Academic libraries and larger public libraries are acting together in formal and informal consortia in a wide range of activities such as wide-area truck delivery systems among libraries, maintenance of union catalogs of books, microforms, manuscripts and periodicals; provision for interlibrary loan; and cooperative purchasing of expensive materials. Fifteen Pennsylvania libraries are either participating or are committed to participate in the computer-based, shared cataloging service offered by the Ohio College Library Center at Columbus, and more will follow. Our land grant university will soon acquire a library-dedicated computer. School librarians are moving toward participation in these programs. These activities clearly extend beyond local boundaries. They are properly a national concern to which a White House Conference can effectively direct attention. It would identify cooperatives on the national level and explore means to improve and extend regional, state and local ones.

Experiments in new methods of organizing and delivering library and information services must be undertaken. The Action Library in Philadelphia is a federally funded experiment which is providing new insights about the library and information needs of students of all ages in an inner city, and how to meet those needs. It has combined sponsorship of the public library and of both public and parochial schools. In Erie a pre-school media library is involving very young children and parents in an exciting world of creative activities such as a story telephone line which tells stories to children dialing the library, and live animals that children borrow as they would a book.

Millersville State College has been selected to participate in the national School Library Manpower Study Project, a program that has identified the competencies needed by school librarians. Changes in library and information specialists' education are emerging from this study. Additional work on the national level is needed in library education.

FUNDING

Since 1958 when federal funds began to flow into libraries, Pennsylvania like its sister states has benefitted greatly in its library programs in schools, colleges, and state institutions as well as public libraries. The current diminishment of federal funds for library programs, however, has a withering effect on the plans that have been made and on the programs already underway. This situation served to emphasize the urgency of the need for a consistent national policy with respect to library and information services. The alternative is halting an uncoordinated growth of these services with wasteful incompatibility among systems, duplication of effort and great variation in the quality and extent of library services available to the people.

As you, Mr. Chairman, stated on October 11, 1973, "there has been a steadily increasing recognition of the concept that all our citizens—are entitled to public library and other services of a certain level and quality. To stimulate and assure an equitable provision of these services, Congress has been sharing the costs with the States and with local governments. This trend has been questioned in recent years.... I believe that people outside Congress should also confront this question more directly."³

³ Brademas, John. *Speech on White House Conference on Library and Information Services*. Congressional Record, October 11, 1973, H8924-8925.

Pennsylvania's fiscal problem is not unique. Our 450 public libraries and the libraries in some 150 academic institutions had a combined expenditure of nearly seventy million dollars in 1971, and this does not include the 4,000 libraries in all our public schools and the hundreds of special interest libraries. The public libraries of our state are organized into a statewide network of local, district and regional libraries, and they are receiving seven and a half million dollars in state funds annually. Yet there are segments of our population that have no library service. Libraries, like other institutions, suffer from inflation. The proportion of library budgets going into salaries is rising while that for purchase of materials is declining. The large urban libraries are having to curtail essential services at a time when information needs are intensifying. Our private colleges and universities and state supported schools are having to cut back on acquisition of materials. Our hospitals and prisons have needs for library service that outpace our ability to meet them. New media are demanded by library users of all kinds. Clearly there is a need for national attention to be given these problems and for the American people to be aware of them. The proposed White House Conference will be an effective step in providing such needed attention.

NATIONAL PROPOSALS

Two plans are in the developmental stage for the generation of a national program. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and the American Library Association have each prepared proposals. By 1976 these proposals will have matured and have been coordinated. The local, state and regional conferences that would precede the White House Conference itself would focus attention on the need for a national program of cooperation and coordination among all types of libraries and information centers.

IN CONCLUSION

In the libraries of our nation today as we approach the bicentennial year lie the records of the vivid and rich achievements of the past. The libraries which we envision for the future will be certain to contain the records of our coming experiences with an even greater degree of accuracy and remembrance for all. This emphasizes the need for consistent national planning between libraries and government units on every level.

In 1790, John Philpot Curran stated, "It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become a prey to the active. The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance."⁴

The proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services can be part of that vigilance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I shall be pleased to try to answer any question from you or members of the committee.

Mr. PITTENGER. I am John Pittenger, secretary of education for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I am appearing before you today to represent not only the Commonwealth, but also the Council of Chief State School Officers, which consists of the chief educational officers in each of the 50 States and the outlying jurisdictions.

I have with me today on my left, Earnest Dorshuck, who is the State Librarian of Pennsylvania; and on my right, Betsey Hoffman, who is the director of our division of school libraries; both of them distinguished people in their own fields and I assure you far more knowledgeable than I am.

I want to say just a word or two to the committee in summarizing in part what I have said in this prepared testimony.

I am very happy to lend whatever weight Pennsylvania and the chiefs can to House Joint Resolutions 734 and 766, asking the calling of a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

⁴Curran, John P. (member of the Irish Parliament, 1780-99), "Speech upon the Right of Election," 1790.

I am particularly pleased that the resolution talks about, as it does, libraries and information services, because it seems to me—and I think I can speak for my fellow chiefs on this point—that that is in fact the real question.

It is not simply a question, as important as that may be, of the role of libraries. It is a larger question even than that.

It is a question of how, in the next 10 or 20 years, the American people are going to have access to information. What kind of information do they need? How will they get it? How will it be organized?

There are some very difficult questions, for example, of the proper roles of the Federal, State, and local governments in this area.

I do not pretend to judge that matter. There are some equally difficult questions about the proper relationship between school libraries, community libraries, college and university libraries, the Library of Congress, State libraries, film centers, and all the other sources of information in this lay and age.

There are equal difficult questions, it seems to me, about the relationships between books and computers and television and films, and all the other ways that we now have of getting information.

I think the librarians in Pennsylvania and elsewhere have done an excellent job over the past 10 years of beginning to transform the nature of their own libraries in the sense in which the library of the Borough of Swarthmore was a library when I went into it as a child. I am sorry to say, some 35 years ago, to the kinds of places that libraries like our State libraries are today.

But, we need help. Usually when I come to Washington, my congressional delegation wails because they know what I want is money.

This is one of the few occasions when I have come down here and what we are asking those of you in the Congress for is not money but leadership, leadership in an area where we have tried to do some things ourselves.

My testimony contains a number of examples of cases in which the State itself, consortia of libraries, both public and private in-State, between Pennsylvania and Ohio and so on, have attempted to grapple with these questions.

I don't think we can do it by ourselves. It seems to me that a White House conference, say, 2 or 3 years from now could provide a kind of leadership which nobody else in the country can, in resolving some of the very perplexing issues that I have raised, both in the written testimony and in the few comments which I have made to this point.

People beginning as long as 10 years ago, you know, have described ourselves as being a kind of society in which information is the real form of capital.

I recall reading a book of Peter Drucker's some 4 or 5 years ago entitled "The Age of Discontinuity." He makes the point there just as land was the principal source of capital in the Middle Ages and perhaps until 200 years ago, then industry and industrial capital became the principal form of wealth.

Now in the past 20 or 30 years we have created, for better or worse, a kind of society in which the essential wealth of the society is information, knowledge.

That poses some fascinating but some very difficult problems, and we want to compliment Congressman Brademas, Congressman Ford, and the members of the very distinguished subcommittee for their in-

terest in this problem and the leadership which they are giving in the area of library information services.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is really all I want to say in the way of formal remarks and I would be most happy to respond to questions from the subcommittee.

Mr. BRADENAS. Thank you very much for a most helpful statement.

What are the biggest problems you have encountered with respect to encouraging planning within the State and across State boundaries in the library and information resources field?

Mr. PITTENGER. One, of course, is simply the problem of funds to which the chairman has already addressed himself.

That situation is so well known to everyone that I probably need not comment further.

Another problem, I would say, particularly when you talk about cooperation across State lines, is what seems to me to be a kind of lack in this field and in others of adequate vehicles for doing that.

It seems to me that one of the things that the White House conference ought to explore is the question of whether or not we can create a political and other institutions in the broadest sense that are capable of dealing with problems across State lines.

It does not make very much sense for Pennsylvania to develop an information system that is wholly independent of what is happening in New Jersey, Ohio, Maryland, and West Virginia.

On the other hand, I am not sure I am terribly keen about the idea of the Office of Education devising an information system for the entire United States.

I would say, therefore, that the lack of adequate mechanisms for dealing with problems on an interstate basis is one of the principal difficulties in the field at the present time.

Mr. BRADENAS. What, if you were asked to come up with an agenda of subjects for discussion by a White House Conference on Libraries, would you propose?

Mr. PITTENGER. I think I have indicated perhaps already, Mr. Chairman, in my comments about three major questions.

One is the problem relationship of the Federal Government, the States, and the local communities.

That is always a perplexing problem. I take it the view of the White House is that the National Government has no role to play in these matters.

That is not a view that I share, but there are some difficult questions about what the proper role is.

Then I think there is another item which ought to be considered and that is the relationship between different kinds of information-providing services.

Citizens in Pennsylvania complain to me from time to time that in a medium-sized community in Pennsylvania we are supporting a school library and three blocks down the street a borough or township or county library.

There may be reasons for that. But I think it also raises some problems.

I would say a third terribly important question is the one of technology—how do computers and television and cable television and the possibility now, I gather, technically feasible of two-way com-

munication by television—how do those things fit into libraries and information services?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

There are many other questions I would put to you but there are many other witnesses and I want to be sure my colleagues have a chance to put questions to you.

Mr. Hansen?

Mr. HANSEN. Let me also express my appreciation for your testimony and your presence here.

Before putting a question to you, I would join in the remarks of our chairman and the chairman of the full committee in paying tribute to the librarians across the country.

I doubt if there is any group in the country that are more dedicated, have a deeper love for their work and, I suspect, get less public recognition for support and encouragement than the librarians.

I know and I am sure you are well acquainted with our State librarian, Helen Miller, who is unable to be here. She has been a very strong supporter of these programs.

I have the privilege of working with Helen during my service in our State legislature. I want to ask you about State support on libraries, in just a moment.

I would endorse the Ford-Brademas proposal for the White House conference. This is a logical and welcome combination of support for an idea whose time indeed has come.

It would seem to me that among all the purposes that a White House conference can serve, and you have alluded to many of the important items that ought to be on the agenda, one of the most important is to give visibility to our libraries and the sad condition many of them are in and what we need to do for them if they are going to serve their purpose.

It is that kind of understanding and enlightenment, it would appear to me, that is essential to the kind of support that is reflected in appropriations at the local level, at the State and at the Federal level.

They all have a role and as you point out properly a White House Conference can help identify the role that each must play in the total effort.

My question relates now to the State role. I must confess that I have been disappointed in noting the level of support that many States, through their State appropriations, have furnished to the libraries.

I have been disappointed that the States have not seen fit to allocate more of their revenue-sharing funds to libraries which are included the purposes of general revenue sharing.

Would you comment on the State level and the success that you have had or lack of it, perhaps, in Pennsylvania in persuading the State legislature that it has an important responsibility in providing funds for libraries.

Mr. PITRENGER. I think there is no question but that the States have room to improve, but I would not include Pennsylvania in that statement.

It seems to me indeed one of the purposes that a White House conference could in fact play is to highlight the State role.

I would not want to suggest for a moment that it is exclusively or even predominantly a Federal role. I think you are absolutely right in saying there is a problem of visibility.

I think partly the modesty and dedication of a great many libraries while on the one hand is commendable, but on the other hand has tended to make them less perhaps vocal than they ought to be in saying they are doing something that is terribly important and it is high time that people stood up and noticed it.

I think that a White House conference could play a very useful role in highlighting the responsibilities of the State in this area and would indeed furnish me with ammunition to go to my legislature and Governor and say, "Listen here, some distinguished folks have considered this problem and have concluded while there is an important Federal role to play, there is a heavy State responsibility that we have not yet met.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Peyser?

Mr. PEYSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am delighted to be here and also to have had the privilege of joining with some of you last night. I hope you do notice in the bipartisan move up here that the chairman is flanked by two Republicans, one on either side of him.

We have him outnumbered two to one at this point, which is at least the odds we need if we are ever in conflict with him.

On this particular issue we are not in conflict at all and there is a very strong bipartisan support for the libraries, for the White House Conference, and I guess more importantly right now for continuing the financial programs and, if possible, enlarging them to improve the library programs throughout the country.

The odds just got turned around. We are even now that the Democrats have come back.

I would like to take this opportunity to deviate for just a moment because I know you are all very deeply involved in this whole educational process, and your voices are heard in many parts of the land.

I understand there are 40 States represented here this morning.

Something was published today in the New York Times which is very disturbing to me and bears very much on the education of our young people. Certainly this is the area that you are working with very largely. A recommendation has been made—and I will ask you your thoughts on it even though I am expressing mine very firmly—by the National Commission on Reform of Secondary Education.

They have come out with a report that in effect is saying that schools should no longer require compulsory attendance after the age of 14. It is now 16 nationally. To me, this would be giving up the ship on education for many, many millions of young people, to say nothing of the impact on the labor situation and otherwise.

It would seem to me that the libraries are where many young people, at least I am going to assume this and then ask, really begin to get their voluntary interest going at this age because they are being stimulated.

Do you find from your experience in this field that there is active participation in the libraries, among young people 14 and older?

Is this an age that people begin to get awakened many times for the use of libraries?

Mr. PITTINGER. I suppose I am the wrong person to ask that question but I will try to give an answer.

I think the people who will follow me to this witness stand are much better able to answer it than I am.

I think the answer in part is yes, there are people between the ages of 14 and 17 who come alive intellectually for the first time.

I had better disassociate myself from the chiefs in the next couple of sentences because I know my distinguished colleagues, most of them, would disagree with what I am about to say.

I don't regard that as being quite the same question as to whether compulsory attendance at those ages is a good thing.

I suspect most of those people who do come alive do so for reasons generated within them. My own unorthodox view is perhaps philosophically it is a mistake. The people who are compelled to be in school are not very good learners and make it impossible for those there.

In Pennsylvania I have concluded there is not much that can be done about that. I think we should be working toward programs where people age 14 to 17 can spend part of their time in school and part in the community.

I think that means a less important rather than more important learning. Learning takes place not only then in school but in the community, in the home, in the factory and elsewhere.

I would like to see a situation developing over the next 10 or 20 years where schools and school libraries are just one source for motivating these young people.

Mr. PEYSER. I don't want to turn this subject into a main issue, but I think we have an obligation which I feel we cannot back away from because we have not found how to stimulate young people perhaps who don't want to be in school.

I think there are so many things in the offing and in creative library programs that I have sense that are by themselves an awakening of people at this age to want to learn.

To put them back out in the community as you say and say, "Go ahead and do something else or we will try to get something going," I really think is giving up.

I won't pursue this as an argument at this point.

I am delighted to have your testimony and certainly support what we are talking about fully here on the libraries.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Lehman?

Mr. LEHMAN. I like to read and I like to see other people read. Once I wrote on the board, when I was a teacher, the quotation was, "Send me a man who reads" and the kid put a comma after the word "man" and put a question mark after the word "reads"—one of the girls in the class.

This is the kind of thing I think we are going to have to address ourselves to as a group and I certainly think that we can do this by working together for this kind of conference.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, again, Dr. Pittenger. We certainly do appreciate your coming here today.

Our next witness is Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, president of the American Council of Learned Societies and chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Dr. Burkhardt has served with great attention to the concerns of that Commission and we are particularly pleased to welcome you back as an old friend of this subcommittee.

STATEMENT OF FREDERICK BURKHARDT, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Dr. BURKHARDT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to be here to testify on this important matter today.

I have submitted a 10-page statement which I will not read in its entirety this morning but I will read from it and then leave some time for questions.

[Statement referred to follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF FREDERICK BURKHARDT, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCES

My name is Frederick Burkhardt. I am President of the American Council of Learned Societies and Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. In my appearance before you today I represent the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and its fifteen presidentially appointed members.

The Commission favors the White House Conference which is called for in House Joint Resolution 734 and 766. The Commission does so wholeheartedly and in the expectation of useful results. We favor this conference because it will reinforce and strengthen the work being undertaken by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and because a White House Conference will draw the attention of the American public to their libraries in a positive and productive way. A White House Conference will give an opportunity to thousands of individuals to express their needs and discuss their problems under conditions calculated to yield concrete improvements and solutions.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is charged by law to provide the President and the Congress, as well as state and local governments, with advice and counsel that will bring about adequate library and information service for all. To fulfill this charge the Commission has been given the authority to conduct studies and surveys and to learn of the adequacies and deficiencies of current library and information service operations. The studies we have completed and the hearings we have held in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago and San Francisco convince us that the character and scope of the problems of obtaining information or other library services can most accurately be ascertained directly from the user of information. The Commission has listened with care to the statements of organizations and agencies within the information and library community. These associations, groups and organizations have given careful attention to the problems that beset them and the public they serve. However, a White House Conference on Library and Information Services would go further and deeper into the problems by offering an ideal opportunity for the needs of all users of information to become known and understood. Other White House conferences have discovered that the "grass-roots" viewpoint can wipe away outmoded practices and substitute a fresh outlook, including entirely new ways of dealing with current needs.

A White House Conference will provide the data and perspectives for planning on the national level as well as on the state and local level. The National Commission is in the early stages of the development of a new national program for library and information service which will be greatly helped by the discussions at the White House Conference. The Commission's program is based on the following assumptions:

First, that all citizens expect realistic and convenient access to library resources and information services in the United States for their self-enrichment and economic well-being.

Second, that the total information resource in the United States is a national resource which should be sustained and made available to the maximum degree possible in the public interest.

Third, that with the help of new technology and with national resolve the disparate collection of libraries and information centers in the United States can become an integrated national system.

Based on these assumptions the Commission's own deliberations have focused on six areas of primary concern:

1. *The needs of users.*—Library and information needs are felt at all levels of society, regardless of an individual's location, social condition or level of intellectual achievement. Each citizen must feel an identity with the local point of contact for his information and be able to gain access to the pertinent part of the total information resources that interests him.
2. *The deficiencies in current services.*—Most libraries are crowded and understaffed. They are critically short of money; they are unable to keep pace with current demands; they have little flexibility to undertake new programs.
3. *The trend toward cooperative action.*—In order to keep local programs alive, many libraries have formed cooperatives. Useful as these stop-gap network arrangements have been, they are not developing according to any national standard. Without technical standards for regional network development we are in danger of spending money on piecemeal programs that may never connect.
4. *The financial base for libraries.*—Because of diverse tax structures, some American communities receive library services according to their ability to pay, rather than their need. Millions of Americans who need library service—particularly the under-privileged, the culturally deprived and the geographically remote—are not getting it.
5. *The potential of new technology.*—The use of computers in libraries has already been pioneered and the principles of use are now understood but direct application has been minimal. The use of micrographics is increasing, but far from widespread. Some library experiments with telefacsimile and CATV have been fruitful, but there are only a handful of operating systems. While libraries have been acquiring audiovisual materials, there is still some reluctance to give the same attention to non-print forms of information that libraries have given to books.
6. *The staffing and manpower needs of libraries and information centers.*—New approaches to educational programs will be needed in library science and information science if library technicians, professionals and auxiliary personnel are to learn to plan, to creatively manage and operate and to function in non-traditional ways in our libraries and information centers.

Since libraries and information centers in the United States are not developing according to any national plan, their growth continues to be uneven and uncohesive. A new philosophy of library and information service is needed, one based on a common sense of direction and purpose and a commitment to national cooperative action.

What the National Commission proposes is a new national program for accomplishing an organizational and technological upgrading of libraries and information centers in the United States. The program advocates Federal funding for the national elements of the program and funding by the states for their jurisdictional share. It calls for the encouragement and development of private as well as public information services.

It would be premature to go into the details of the Commission's present suggestions for a new national program since they are in very tentative form. We know that our ideas will be changed and refined by exposing them to the widest possible range of public and professional opinion and criticism. Our goal, however, is clear and we are firmly committed to it. We want to give everyone in the country, regardless of social or economic condition, equal access to the rich information resources this country possesses. The task will not be easy. It will take intense professional energy to work out the complex problems inherent in such a program and to weigh the potential benefits and costs of new concepts and new solutions. A carefully planned White House Conference can contribute greatly toward this goal.

* * * * *

Careful planning cannot be done quickly. If the 1976 date is to be met, concerted action is required now. We conceive of the activity of a White House Conference in three parts, of which the national gathering is the climatic event. The initial phase, whose purpose is to set up the structure for the 1976 conference, would take six months. During that time the following steps would be taken:

1. Organize the appointed committee and plan its operation.
2. Recruit, hire and develop staff to support this phase and to continue throughout the conference activity.

3. Develop and test systems for program, financial and management control.
4. Develop detailed three-year plans for the regional, state and national programs mentioned below.
5. Hold ten regional planning conferences to establish the initial guidelines for the state conferences mentioned below. Plan for 25 delegates at each session.
6. Coalesce the guidelines from the regional conferences into an instructional document for the 56 state and territorial conferences and for the national conference.

Phase two would include the state and territorial preparatory meetings and the national White House Conference. The following steps are the basic activities of this period:

1. Increase the staff to assist with the state and national meetings.
2. Distribute and implement the instructional document for the 56 state and territorial meetings.
3. Prepare and distribute necessary program materials, research documents, study results, statistical analyses, etc., to participants and observers.
4. Hold the 56 state/territorial conferences and receive the recommendations from each.
5. Continue the planning effort adapting the national conference plan to the results coming from state conferences.
6. Prepare documentation for the national conference and its delegates.
7. Hold a five-day White House Conference for 2,800 delegates.

The final phase would amass the recommendations of the White House Conference and prepare for future activity. Some of the steps required are:

1. Reduce staff to those needed for editorial, financial and management functions.
2. Complete all financial activity and audit the accounts.
3. Prepare and issue transactions of the conference. Transmit them to the President and Congress.
4. Summarize and analyze the conference recommendations, publish them and prepare for necessary action. Transmit the recommendations to the President and Congress with a program and timetable for implementation.
5. Integrate the recommendations into the ongoing activity of the NCLIS.
6. Terminate the conference activity.

It is the Commission's recommendation that Federal funds be appropriated and expended to cover the following:

1. Expenses and *per diem* for the appointed committee as proposed in the Joint Resolutions.
2. Staff salaries, operating expenses and travel funds for the Commission and staff.
3. Expenses of 25 delegates for each of 10 regional planning meetings.
4. Expenses of 150 delegates for each of 56 state/territorial meetings.
5. Expenses of 2,800 delegates for a five day national conference.
6. Expenses for preparation and issuance of necessary reports, studies, surveys and recommendations.
7. Such other expenses as are reasonable and proper in carrying out the functions of a White House Conference.

Some estimates of these costs are in preparation by the NCLIS staff. The use of Federal funds for regional, state and territorial meetings is required to assure that the quality and direction of the planning lead progressively toward the national conference. A basic level of participation from each state can be expected only if the Federal government accepts the responsibility for providing incentive funding. With Federal participation, the state conferences can be guided to develop around congruent themes that will lead cohesively toward the national conference.

House Joint Resolutions 734 and 766 honor the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science by making it responsible for directing the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. The Commission will receive the assignment enthusiastically and begin at once to carry out the details of planning and organization.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I shall be pleased to try to answer any questions from you or the members of the committee.

Mr. BURKHARDT. My name is Frederick Burkhardt. I am here as Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I would like to add to the statement that I have submitted to you the following sentence: My views do not represent those of the administration, which I understand are being separately conveyed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science favors the White House Conference which is called for in House Joint Resolutions 734 and 766.

The Commission does so wholeheartedly and in the expectation of useful results. It is going to strengthen the work that the National Commission is trying to do.

It will draw the attention of the American public to the problems of libraries and information services as no other vehicle can possibly do.

It will be enormously helpful in finding out what are the needs of the people of the United States. Not only will it raise the problems and focus attention on those problems, but it will also provide ideas for their solution.

One of the things this Commission has found most useful in its work has been the regional hearings we have been conducting in various parts of the country.

We find the sense of immediacy and urgency that the people feel and the variety of their needs and the variety of their ideas has been tremendously stimulating to the Commission: We have derived a great deal of help from those hearings.

We have been trying to get as close as we possibly can to the actual users.

The White House Conference would deepen and broaden our perspective. It would bring about a forum for a rising set of solutions and priorities, as well as procedures for getting on with the job that would be uniquely important.

I cannot think of a better way to celebrate our bicentennial year than with a White House Conference on Libraries.

In my statement, I have also mentioned that this White House Conference would be enormously important to the Commission in its work on a national program for library and information services. We have started to draft such a program and we have put forth a tentative statement which is now being discussed by librarians and by users, by technical people. We are in the process of revising this. By 1976 we would have a program that would be sufficiently worked out to become a major item on the agenda of the White House Conference at all levels. The Conference would be to put our plans, as we hope they will be at that time, before a very large public with very different needs and varieties of informational services in their States and regions. We would submit this document for their proposal and criticism, and I cannot think of any better way of getting a national program than one that was submitted to the people of the United States directly.

Also, in my statement I have put down an outline of the steps that would be required, it seems to us, for the planning and the holding of such a conference. Since House Resolutions 734 and 766 honor the National Commission by making it responsible for directing the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, we felt we should put down as clearly as we could now what we think would have

to be gone through in the planning. I will not go into the details, but it is a rather lengthy set of steps that would be involved.

We have also done some tentative estimating on costs and, again, I cannot give you any specific figure, but if there are questions about budget, I have someone here who can answer any questions that you might have.

I think the important thing to mention about this planning is that the financial support at the Federal level is terribly important in the planning because this will make it possible for a general set of guidelines to be prepared and for some kind of cohesive planning to be done which will bring together and coordinate all of the various State conferences and also help to get equal treatment and discussion in the various States.

Since their resources differ, if we are to have adequate conferences in each State, Federal funds would be used to equalize and bring about this same standard and quality of meetings in each State.

We visualize a series of meetings and conferences that would culminate in a large White House Conference in the end with perhaps 2,500 to 2,800 federally sponsored delegates.

In our tentative planning we have drawn on the experience on the White House Conference on Aging which I believe was a very successful one and which produced many useful recommendations and results. I am certain this White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services will, likewise, produce many useful recommendations and results.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman, but I will be very happy to answer any questions that I can.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you very much, Dr. Burkhardt.

We should like to have you along with two other witnesses respond as members of a panel and then we shall have two subsequent panels.

Perhaps before we put questions to you, Mr. Harlan and Miss Lowrie will come up to the witness stand and then we will put questions to all three of you.

Our next witness is an old friend of the Chair's also president of the American Library Society in South Bend, Ind., Mr. Harlan.

STATEMENT OF JOHN B. HARLAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN LIBRARY SOCIETY

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

My name is John B. Harlan. I am president of the American Library Society, an educational organization founded in 1970 to promote the advancement of the library and information sciences; to aid the library and information professions; and to protect the freedoms of access to information, the press, and speech.

It is a pleasure and an honor for me to be able to testify before the Select Subcommittee on Education on behalf of the executive board of the American Library Society in support of House Joint Resolution 734, House Joint Resolution 766, and related resolutions, to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

Libraries and information centers play an invaluable role in American life. Through providing access to information and ideas of great

variety, libraries and information centers are not only a precious tool for the individual in filling his or her educational, occupational, and recreational needs and desires but are also the foundation of our freedom and democracy and the foundation of future civilization.

Therefore, the strengthening and expansion of these facilities and their services is of the utmost importance for Americans as individuals, as Americans, and as members of our civilization.

The proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services, under the direction of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, seems to me to be the most logical way in which to attain the long-range planning necessary for effective strengthening and expansion of these treasured national resources.

And there can be no time more appropriate for undertaking this nationwide planning than during our bicentennial year, 1976.

Our libraries and information centers need continuing strengthening and improvement not only to keep pace with the day-to-day accumulation of information and ideas, but also in order to effectively handle the increasing demands of the American public in the educational, occupational, and recreational areas.

Libraries and information centers have always provided reinforcement for the basic education provided on the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels.

As this basic education is replaced by more individualized and intensive learning on all levels, libraries and information centers will need to provide a strong foundation and even stronger reinforcement for the curriculum.

In my personal experience, I have depended on my school and public libraries for support and reinforcement from the individualized reading programs of elementary school to the specialized minicourses I am taking in social studies and English in high school. I expect to rely more heavily on libraries and information centers as I go on to college.

As occupations become more specialized and Americans need and desire to advance their knowledge of their occupations, libraries and information centers will also need to be strengthened and improved.

Special libraries and information centers will require attention so as to better service their industries.

And finally, as Americans have more and more leisure time to pursue their increased and more varied hobbies, our libraries and information centers will need to strengthen and improve their materials in the recreational area.

Our libraries and information centers are treasured national resources of great and lasting value which serve America by providing access to information and ideas of the greatest variety in innumerable areas.

The late President John F. Kennedy expressed the importance of libraries very well when he said:

For the individual, the doors to the library lead to the richest treasures of our open society: to the power of knowledge, to the training and skills necessary for productive employment, to the wisdom, the ideals, and the culture which enrich life, and to the creative, self-disciplined understanding of society needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world.

I believe we can keep those doors open with the long-range planning and setting of goals which would be made possible by this proposed White House Conference.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the select subcommittee, for this opportunity to testify in support of House Joint Resolutions 734 and 766, to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, on behalf of the American Library Society.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you very much, John, for a very thoughtful and obviously well prepared statement.

Our next witness is Miss Jean Lowrie, president of the American Library Association.

STATEMENT OF JEAN LOWRIE, PRESIDENT, THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Dr. LOWRIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Jean E. Lowrie. I am president of the American Library Association, a nonprofit educational organization of about 30,000 members. This includes librarians, library trustees, library educators and citizens from other related professions who are interested in the promotion of quality library services.

I am pleased to be here this morning to testify in support of House Joint Resolutions 734 and 766 authorizing and requesting the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

May I also say it is a pleasure for me, as a resident of the State of Michigan, to be here in support of a bill which Congressman Ford has also presented.

The American Library Association is pleased to have this opportunity to testify before a committee which has through the years supported major legislation to strengthen public, school, and higher education library services.

The committee's recognition of the special needs of libraries today in light of the multifaceted services offered and the exponential growth of information, has been heartening to those of us in the profession.

The legislation which recognizes the need for Federal support—in the broadest interpretations—the need to bring State and national library leaders together to talk with the citizens who use these services is another important contribution.

It is particularly appropriate that during 1976, the Bicentennial of our country, recognition should be given to the role of libraries.

Since the beginning of our country's history under the leadership of such statesmen as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, libraries have been significant institutions in the United States.

Through the years libraries have not only collected the history, the thoughts, the scientific knowledge, the arts of our citizens and of the world, they have also been of assistance to the educational needs of all people.

Traditionally, libraries in the United States have been concerned about the needs of the young and the elder citizens, of the poor as well as the wealthy, of the minorities and other multiple ethnic groups—living in all parts of the country.

Libraries have become a basic part of education from kindergarten through higher and continuing educational institutions.

Libraries are a part of industry, of scientific research, of cultural developments, of the wide range of intellectual and recreational needs of the individual.

The American library is one of the great institutions in this country and a leader in library development internationally.

I can verify this from personal experience as president of the International Association of School Librarianship.

It is noteworthy that the centennial of the American Library Association—the largest of all the library associations—coincides with the Bicentennial of the country.

Joint celebrations of these events could well be recognized by a White House Conference. Likewise, such recognition given to all library associations and the special services represented by them through the 1976 conference would be appropriate and significant.

The American Library Association has already gone on record in support of such a conference. I have attached the resolution which reflects this stand to my prepared statement, as attachment A. It is dated January 28, 1972.

[Attachment A follows:]

ATTACHMENT A

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARIES RESOLUTION

Whereas the American public has a greater need for knowledge and for access to information than in any previous time in history:

Whereas only a network of public, school, academic, and special libraries can provide information services to the total population;

Whereas the American Library Association and its colleagues and affiliates possess the leadership to communicate to the American public the uses and potential of library services;

Whereas only national attention to the welfare of libraries and the growth and development of their services can produce the needed wide base of support for all kinds of libraries;

Whereas the National Commission on Libraries is now in being and its recommendations merit nationwide consideration: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Library Association call upon the President and the Congress to call a White House Conference on Libraries in the year 1974;

Be it further resolved, That said conference be based upon conferences in every state and territory which involve the lay leadership of the states' communities and the library leadership from their libraries of all types;

Be it further resolved, That the American Library Association offer its full cooperation in the planning of a White House Conference on Libraries.

Adopted by the Council of the American Library Association at the 1972 Midwinter Meeting, Chicago, Ill., January 28, 1972.

I believe this resolution points up the association's breadth of concern. We are interested in library service to all. We are concerned about the problem of the functionally illiterate adult and of the child who has little or no contact with reading material.

We support the right to read concept. We believe that the American public has a greater need for access to information than at any other time in history.

"Libraries should provide books and other materials presenting all points of view concerning the problems and issues of our times," which is stated in the library bill of rights. This is included as attachment B to my testimony.

[Attachment B follows:]

ATTACHMENT B

LIBRARY BILL OF RIGHTS

The Council of the American Library Association reaffirms its belief in the following basic policies which should govern the services of all libraries.

1. As a responsibility of library service, books and other library materials selected should be chosen for values of interest, information and enlightenment of all the people of the community. In no case should library materials be excluded because of the race or nationality or the social, political, or religious views of the authors.

2. Libraries should provide books and other materials presenting all points of view concerning the problems and issues of our times; no library materials should be proscribed or removed from libraries because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval.

3. Censorship should be challenged by libraries in the maintenance of their responsibility to provide public information and enlightenment.

4. Libraries should cooperate with all persons and groups concerned with resisting abridgment of free expression and free access to ideas.

5. The rights of an individual to the use of a library should not be denied or abridged because of his age, race, religion, national origins or social or political views.

6. As an institution of education for democratic living, the library should welcome the use of its meeting rooms for socially useful and cultural activities and discussion of current public questions. Such meeting places should be available on equal terms to all groups in the community regardless of the beliefs and affiliations of their members, provided that the meetings be open to the public.

Adopted June 18, 1948, amended February 2, 1961, and June 27, 1967, by the ALA Council.

By official action of the Council on February 3, 1951, the *Library Bill of Rights* shall be interpreted to apply to all materials and media of communication used or collected by libraries.

Dr. LOWRIE. The American Library Association also supports freedom of public access to information about the Federal Government and its activities, as recognized in the Freedom of Information Act.

We urge strict enforcement of the provisions of this act. We also support the depository library program through which designated libraries receive Federal Government documents and make them available to the public.

The depository system must be improved and extended, so that the program not only operates more smoothly but also provides more materials in a variety of formats.

Vigorous agency support is needed to include more publications within the depository system, which has the potential to make a major contribution toward providing all the American public with access to the information they need about their government and its work.

The association, however, is fully aware that libraries often appear to be "low man on the totem pole" during budget time at local, State and national levels; that a lack of understanding of their potential has limited legislative support at all levels; that there is often a breakdown in communication between library planners and other official administrators.

The abrupt abandonment of Federal aid to libraries proposed this year in the fiscal year 1974 U.S. Budget is a prime example of this breakdown.

This termination would have been a complete reversal of the national library policy signed into law in 1970 by President Nixon in

the act establishing the National Commission on Libraries and information Science, Public Law 91-245.

I am pleased and gratified that Congress continues to recognize its responsibility to implement this policy, most recently by approving fiscal year 1974 appropriations for all the library programs despite the zero budget recommendations.

However, the public forum a White House Conference provides would enable a knowledgeable body of citizens to focus national attention on the fiscal problems of libraries.

An example of the type of thinking and study needed for background preparation for the State and national conferences is the USOE-commissioned paper entitled, "Basic Issues in the Governmental Financing of Public Library Services."

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this made a part of the hearing record.

[Information referred to follows:]

BASIC ISSUES IN THE GOVERNMENTAL FINANCING OF PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES

PREFATORY NOTE

The objective of this paper is to examine and generally evaluate the bases, patterns of support and funding mechanisms through which Federal, state and local governments finance public library services. A need exists to describe and analyze critically the extent to which existing support patterns are adequate in terms of sound principles of public finance and in the light of existing and future funding problems in the public library field. Legislative bodies at all levels of government, public library administrators and interested observers are expressing increasing concern over the funding of public library services as questions concerning role, support bases and changing library service needs become evident. Roles and responsibilities of Federal, state and local governments are being discussed and studied, but efforts to examine the support base as a problem in inter-governmental finance have been sporadic and diffused. Thus, the specific intent is to describe and assess the present public library financing system and to delineate key issues for consideration in either reaffirming its continued use, or in the development of new approaches. Special emphasis is given to illuminating those issues and factors affecting metropolitan areas—both core city and suburban fringes.

The perspective includes Federal, state and local legal bases, policies and mechanisms used in financing public libraries' capital and operational needs. The issues, however, provide information essential to the development of alternative role and funding options for consideration at the Federal level. The paper is not intended to provide specific recommendations for action by any level of government. The inquiry also suggests the need for, and possible directions of, additional research required to resolve the issues developed. The examination is based on secondary source data and available research materials and did not involve any *de novo* assessment of library service needs or the collection of new data on funding levels among local communities.

Rodney P. Lane, Senior Associate, directed the project and was assisted by Ronald M. Whitfield, Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Bucknell University, Philip Tabas, Graduate Student in City Planning, University of Pennsylvania, and Bernard Pasqualini, Graduate Student, School of Library Science, Drexel University.

Dr. Lowell A. Martin, Professor, Graduate School of Library Science, Columbia University, Mr. Keith Doms, Director, Free Library of Philadelphia, and Dr. Thomas J. Davy, Director, New Jersey Public Service Institute provided invaluable guidance and consultation to the project and critically reviewed the paper. Responsibility for the research performed and judgments expressed remain with GSS.

CHARLES P. CELLA,

Director, Government Studies and Systems June 1973.

I. PERSPECTIVE ON PUBLIC LIBRARY FINANCE: AN OVERVIEW

THE CURRENT SCENE

In a number of respects, it would have been easier to prepare this paper a year or two ago when revenue sharing was more a concept and less a reality. Only four years ago, Richard Leach, writing in *Libraries at Large*, stated:

There is no doubt that the rapid burgeoning of Federal aid to libraries in recent years has had a major impact on library needs and on the solution of the nation's library problems. Indeed, it would appear that the battle for library aid has been largely won. The Government has recognized libraries as a vital part of the total education complex and has made a definite and long-range commitment to aid libraries in fulfilling their role.¹

Matching the glowing optimism of that statement against the following terse statement in the Federal Budget for FY 1974 indicates the magnitude of current turbulence in the public library financing field.

Grants and payments are made to States, educational institutions, and other agencies for support of library programs under the Library Services and Construction Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Higher Education Act. In 1973, library programs . . . are being funded under a temporary continuing resolution in effect for the period from July 1, 1972, to February 28, 1973. In 1974, Federal support will be discontinued.²

Admittedly, support of libraries is one of the designated objects included in the general revenue sharing measure under which \$20 billion will be distributed to states and local governments over the next five years. But even the language of the revenue sharing act is guarded and somewhat convoluted as it states: "Funds received by units of local government under this subtitle may be used only for *priority* expenditures. For purposes of this title, the term 'priority expenditures' means only (1) ordinary and necessary maintenance and operating expenses—and—(2) ordinary and necessary capital expenditures authorized by law" (emphasis added).³ While in some instances, public libraries have already received, or have been promised, some of these funds, few library officials are sanguine about future prospects. Many agree with the statement, as *The Wall Street Journal* puts it, that the President's proposed budget cuts are likely to "dim" the lamp of book-learning. Federal aid to libraries represents about \$140 million—a relatively small amount, and only about 7 percent of the nation's library expenditures. Nevertheless, Federal input is crucial in the view of most librarians, perhaps far more important than direct aid. Federal programs under the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) have required and triggered a more substantial flow of state funds in support of local libraries. Oddly enough, the reported success of the present program is used as part of the argument for its elimination. More basically, however, as the *Journal* article points out, "The Administration says libraries are local things, which Uncle Sam has no business paying for. . . . (and that) . . . librarians can make up the loss of earmarked aid funds by persuading state and local officials to let them have revenue sharing dollars. Librarians doubt they can compete with teachers, firemen, sewage treaters and other local operatives for those precious revenues Washington has promised to share with the states and towns and cities."⁴

So there you have it: the main support program, for public libraries at the Federal level, which grew from its initial form in 1956, which was supported by the noblest rhetoric of successive Presidents, and which expended about \$500 million in its 16-year history—is now under threatened extinction. A policy of clear and continuing Federal involvement in the fiscal support and functional development of public libraries is now under threatened reversal by a program of intergovernmental fiscal reform supported by a new notion that such institutions should be the *exclusive* concern of state and local governments.

This is the perspective of the moment, but it may prove to be transitory, depending on how Congress responds to the proposed Presidential budget cuts and the special revenue sharing measures now under consideration.

¹ Richard H. Leach, in *Libraries at Large*, Douglas M. Knight and E. Shepley Nourse, Editors, RR Bowker Company, New York, 1969, p. 377.

² The Budget of the U.S., 1974, Appendix, p. 432.

³ State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, Section 163.

⁴ *The Wall Street Journal*, Tuesday, February 27, 1973, p. 42.

POSSIBILITIES AND PROSPECTS UNDER REVENUE SHARING

The concept of revenue sharing, in one form or another, has been around for a number of years. It represents a response to a variety of needs and observed developments in intergovernmental fiscal affairs including the following:

- the accumulation of vast fiscal resources and power of the Federal government, a product in large measure, of the elasticity and productivity of the Federal income tax in an expanding economy;
- a continuing expansion of Federal aid programs from \$6.6 billion in 1959 (14 percent of state-local expenditures) to \$45 billion in FY 1973 (24 percent of state-local expenditures);
- the distribution of Federal aid through an increasing maze of categorical programs (over 500 in 1972) with much attendant red tape and dissatisfaction with performance evidenced at all governmental levels;
- the continuing dire financial circumstances affecting local governments, particularly larger urban governments, as they face increasingly restricted tax bases and higher service costs.

The expanded use of block grants and various grant consolidation schemes were measures seen as compatible with revenue sharing, but sudden budget slashes including elimination of specific programs, were not a part of that concept. There is increasing evidence that some major budget cuts will be restored: witness the Administration's change of heart with respect to the funding of day care centers. Furthermore, there is evidence of second thoughts about the wide-spread elimination of categorical aid programs. Senator Muskie, in introducing the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1973, now awaiting Congressional action, reported results of a nation-wide poll of local government officials seeking reactions to revenue sharing and elimination of categorical aid programs. The poll indicated that many local officials see revenue sharing serving one kind of need, while categorical aid serves other needs. As a local official from Portland, Oregon responded:

The goal to be achieved through revenue sharing has no relationship with the goals to be achieved through the categorical grant program. An example is that I should not expect revenue sharing would accelerate the construction of waste treatment plants or solid waste disposal systems, however, I am confident that a strong categorical grant program would achieve this national goal. It is my conclusion then that categorical grant programs should not be curtailed because of revenue sharing, but should be continued according to the national goals as set by Congress.⁸

Congress is likely to hear an increasing number of such statements as the potential effects of budget cuts and categorical grant aid eliminations are realized. Some observers are now calling for a postponement of consideration of the proposed four special revenue sharing measures for at least one year and a reinstatement at current levels of the grant programs affected. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), a leading exponent of revenue sharing in the past, will hold hearings on the impact of the measure at its June meeting, 1973.

But make no mistake. If current cut-backs and grant program eliminations win Congressional approval, local public libraries are likely to face tough financial sledding as they vie with other demands for the local and state tax dollar. Witness the strong advice of L. L. Ecker-Racz, former Assistant Director of ACIR:

Political leaders (should) muster the intestinal fortitude to resist using much of its revenue sharing entitlements, especially with initial years, for operating purposes. It should strive to dedicate these funds to non-recurring capital outlays, to tax reductions to replace tax anticipatory borrowing, possibly even refunding callable bonds.⁹

The event of revenue sharing, the proposed elimination of funding LSCA, and their combined potential negative impact on the governmental financing of public libraries should be seen neither as a special vendetta against libraries, nor as a reasoned position of new Federal policy in this area. LSCA represents simply one of the many Federal programs whose initiation and expansion was made possible by felicitous fiscal conditions and the hard work of such interested groups as the American Library Association and library officials throughout the

⁸ Information Bulletin No. 73-4, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, April, 1973, p. 2.

⁹ L. L. Ecker-Racz, National Conference on State Supervision of Local Government Fiscal Performance, October, 1972, Philadelphia.

Nation. Pressure to establish Federal policy for libraries was started as early as 1944 but achieved only relatively limited results with the enactment of the Library Services Act of 1956. Statements that the program has been so successful that it is no longer needed, or that it has represented a too little and too late effort are merely rationalizations or defensive justifications—neither is supported by hard measurable facts.

A BROADER PERSPECTIVE IS REQUIRED

Regardless of the outcome of the revenue sharing issue and the Congressional review of the President's budget proposals, the problem of adequate and equitable funding for public libraries remains. Federal funding has represented only 7 percent of total library expenditures and has triggered a comparable level of funding from the states. As everyone knows, the bulk of the financial load falls upon local government supported in large measure by the real estate tax base. Federal fiscal support and the impact of a reasoned, consistent policy about the development of public library services are, of course, important—perhaps even crucial. But a real understanding of library finance problems requires review and analysis of the public library, its development and history as a social institution, some insight as to its future role, and consideration of basic factors affecting, or likely to affect, the present pattern and effectiveness of its financial support.

The public library is a unique social and cultural institution, but that uniqueness should properly be viewed as *both* an asset and a liability. Concern over the financing system supporting public libraries has greatly increased recently because of erosions and weaknesses in the fiscal condition of local government and, as described above, because of Federal budget cut-backs and the unknown impact of general and special revenue sharing. The problem has deeper roots, however. It also involves changing perceptions of the role of the public libraries, changing library service needs and the response to those needs, the costs and benefits of library services, and local, state and Federal roles in supporting library services. Public libraries in this country have a rich heritage in private philanthropy. Perhaps it is true, in part at least, that this history has delayed the movement toward a fuller recognition of public responsibility and funding support for library services. This factor, plus the low political visibility of public libraries, and the continuing single and separate status of libraries with respect to other functions of government may have retarded development of more rational, responsive systems of local and intergovernmental fiscal support of public library services.

This is the perspective from which the identification and discussion of basic issues in the governmental financing of public library services will be undertaken. Succeeding sections will briefly review the history, critically evaluate some perceived major current problems, and examine potential future dimensions of public library services as a basis for the discussion of these basic issues.

II. GROWTH OF PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES AND GOVERNMENTAL FINANCING PATTERNS

EARLY DEVELOPMENT

The history and development of public libraries are well-documented in the literature. Only highlights will be included here. The earliest forms of public library service in the United States were the "circulating" libraries of the colonial period. The libraries generally charged a fee for each book borrowed, or in other instances, membership fees were assessed and only members were allowed to borrow books from the library. Benjamin Franklin, that inveterate inventor, is often credited as the originator of this type of library in America when, together with some of his associates, he founded the Library Company in 1731. Other forms of library service in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries included large private collections and the collections of philosophical and scientific societies. These latter collections were sometimes quite prominent and strong scholarly libraries. But their strength depended upon endowment and legacies from wealthy members and by the end of the nineteenth century all of these early forms of library had been eclipsed by a new type of public library.

The modern public library is difficult to define precisely, but its major features were described as early as 1876: "The 'public library' . . . is established by state laws, is supported by local taxation or voluntary gifts, is managed as a public

trust, and every citizen of the city or town which maintains it has an equal share in its privileges of reference and circulation."⁷ According to this definition, the two essential features of a public library are the necessity for universal service and the link between the library and governmental authority. This link was forged for the first time in 1848 when Boston passed a special law permitting the establishment of a public library and levying an annual tax for its support. The Boston Public Library opened its doors in 1854. The reading room was open to all adults and "recommended" young people.

Municipal support for public libraries spread to other cities, but the amount of revenue contributed by municipal governments to local libraries was rarely very large. The largest contributors to free public libraries were philanthropists: John Jacob Astor gave \$400,000 to New York City to establish and maintain a free public library; other philanthropists included Lenox, Tilden, Fiske, Rockefeller, Morgan, Folger, Widener, and Mellon; the greatest of all the philanthropists was Carnegie. The list of Andrew Carnegie's benefactions for libraries is tremendous. Carnegie funds supported the erection of 1,677 library buildings in 1,408 different communities from 1896 to 1923. In one instance, Carnegie donated \$5.2 million for the erection of 65 branch libraries in New York City alone.

THE GROWTH AND IMPACT OF GOVERNMENTAL INTEREST: LOCAL AND STATE

Although private philanthropy has played an important role in the historical growth and development of public libraries, the major thrust for library development has been provided by local, state, and federal governments. The first state law providing for the establishment of public libraries was passed in New Hampshire in 1848. This act did not provide state aid for libraries. However, it did allow local authorities to levy taxes for library support, provided for free access for all, and allowed the city or town to receive bequests or gifts on behalf of the library. Massachusetts soon followed New Hampshire's lead and added a limit on the extent of municipal support for libraries. This law also allowed for the possibility of state aid for libraries from the education fund. Other states soon passed similar laws. By the end of the nineteenth century, all states had passed legislation providing for the establishment of public libraries and the levying of local taxes for their support. Furthermore, by 1875 all states had established a State Library for use by governmental officials, the judiciary, and generally the citizens residing near the state capitol. In some respects, concern about the public library and its relationship to the State Library was an outgrowth of that Library's official duties. In any event, the public library functions soon grew beyond the mere provision of a circulating collection: a new role of extending library service to rural areas was developing and after 1890 most states had adopted plans for this service through their own library commissions and the State Library.

The relationship between the governmental library, in this case the State Library, and the development of public library services deserves analysis. This developmental role is also observable at the Federal level where the Library of Congress is viewed as the "national library", but is also criticized for not performing its leadership role. As Harold Orlans puts it: "LC (Library of Congress) responds rather than initiates; somehow our most indispensable library seems politically and administratively isolated from other major libraries within or outside of government. It is an empire unto itself, benevolent and hospitable, perhaps, but an empire nonetheless, rather than an agency involved in all of the normal processes of responsible and responsive democratic government."⁸ Orlans then goes on to make what he describes as a widely supported proposal to transfer the Library of Congress to the Executive branch sans its Legislative Reference Service. The justification advanced for this proposal is as follows: "At one stroke, it would remove all of the difficulties of formulating concerted Federal library and information policies which are attributable to the separation of powers."⁹ The move is described as facilitating common direction for the Library as well as for Executive departments and agencies; "the Library could in turn" exercise a markedly greater influence over relevant Government pro-

⁷ U.S. Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States: 1876 Report*, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1876, p. 477.

⁸ Observations and Government Library Organization and Policy by Harold Orlans, in *Libraries at Large*, edited by Douglas M. Knight and E. Shepley Nourse, RR Bowker Company, New York and London, 1969, pp. 387-388.

⁹ *Ibid* p. 388.

grams, and serve more frequently as staff or Executive agent for coordinating these programs."¹⁰

The critical point to be made is this: the growth of public libraries is marked by a lack of clear delineation of functions between (1) providing library services, and (2) administering a broad program of developmental assistance to local public libraries. The orientation of these two functions is entirely different. Different agencies, staffed by quite different personnel, are required. It is dubious to assume that an agency whose operating objective is to provide a service—however ramified and complex—can at the same time provide administrative leadership and direction to an essentially broad-gauged governmental program, involving various levels of government and a whole set of intergovernmental fiscal and functional relationships. Such a situation is a little like assignment of national health care to the Walter Reed Hospital. Yet, this blurring of roles and lack of a clear delineation of "service providing" vis à vis governmental administrative responsibilities is evident in the developmental history of libraries, particularly as it relates to public libraries.

Library service grew immensely during the nineteenth century, but the growth was largely limited to urban areas. A vast number of people in rural areas had little or no library service at all. Recognizing this need, states began to encourage a new form of library development—the county library. The first county library was established in Ohio in 1898, and within the next twenty-five years county libraries developed in other states as well, principally in the Midwest and Far West. County libraries emerged and developed at a painfully slow pace. A major reason for this slow development was finance: rural areas tend to lag in governmental development because they operate on a relatively low tax base and resist expenditure of tax dollars for new services.

ESTABLISHMENT AND GROWTH OF FEDERAL INTEREST AND INVOLVEMENT

Library development was progressing in several states, but foundering in most other states. There was no concerted movement nationwide. While the need for Federal government intervention was recognized as early as 1944, it was not until 1956 that the national government stepped in with a bold new initiative. In that year, Congress passed the Library Services Act, the first major piece of Federal legislation for the support of public libraries. The Act required each state to prepare a plan, the approval of which was a prerequisite to the use of Federal funds. A primary goal of the Act was the extension of library service to the rural population. Aid was precluded from towns with a population of more than 10,000.

Amendments in 1964, under the title "The Library Services and Construction Act", broadened the scope to include grants for construction of library facilities. Equally important, the new act recognized the need to support libraries in urban as well as rural areas. Plan requirements placed on the states were revised accordingly. Federal funds were allocated according to a formula which recognized only two basic factors: population and income. Each state was entitled to a share of the total federal grant equal to the ratio of the state's population to the total population of the country. However, in order to receive its full share, each state had to provide matching state and local funds based on the ratio of the state's per capita income to the national average per capita income. Thus, wealthier states were required to provide more matching funds than poorer states. A stipulation was added that in no case would federal funds for library service and construction exceed sixty-six percent, nor be less than thirty-three percent, of the total costs. Determination of the use of Federal funds was left in the hands of the state library agency. It should be noted that the revised act represents a kind of limited revenue sharing measure. Its objective clearly was a redistribution of tax revenues in support of library services. Except for the state plan requirement, none of the fiscal support provisions relates directly to library needs, or library services. Thus, the current level of library services, differential service needs, and requirements to provide specified library services are not included as a part of Federal subsidy machinery.

In 1966 LSCA was amended to identify three new areas for improvement in library service. With these amendments, LSCA provided Federal support in the following major categories:

¹⁰ *Ibid* p. 388.

(1) Library Services (Title I): support to be used for books and other library materials, salaries, equipment and other operating expenses.

(2) Library Construction (Title II): support to be used for necessary capital expenditures, such as a new building.

(3) Interlibrary Cooperation (Title III): support to be used for the establishment and maintenance of local, regional, state, or interstate cooperative networks of libraries, including public-nonpublic library networks.

(4) Services to the Institutionalized (Title IV-A): assistance in the provision of library service to inmates of prisons, state schools and hospitals, orphanages and other institutionalized individuals.

(5) Services to the Physically Handicapped (Title IV-B): support to be used in the establishment or improvement of library service to the blind or visually handicapped individuals who are unable to use conventional printed materials.

The 1970 amendments to LSCA stipulated the strengthening of metropolitan public libraries as regional resource centers, and added, as a goal, the expanded use of Federal funds in areas with a large percentage of disadvantaged persons.

Federal legislation has had a lasting influence on the statewide development of public libraries. Although the amount of Federal aid has been small in relation to total library expenditures, the effect of federal aid has been much greater. Federal aid encouraged the states to accept increased responsibility for support of public libraries. As the National Advisory Commission on Libraries noted, there is evidence that LSCA "has stimulated increases in state aid to local public libraries and that it has resulted in the establishment of state aid in nine states." However, even though the percentage increases in state aid may be substantial, "only a few states appropriate significant per capita amounts of state aid."¹¹

Thus, Federal funds, accompanied by a matching requirement and plan preparation, stimulated the states' response to public library needs and strengthened the administrative and planning roles on the state library agency. Local libraries could look to the state as well as local government for relief of some their pressing fiscal problems. The trend toward state-supported library services has been described as "one of the potentially most important developments during the past ten to fifteen years in public library systems."¹² It cannot be said, however, that these increases in state fiscal support have resulted in an excessive or monolithic pattern of state control over the development of public library systems.

If anything, one might characterize the lack of increased state administrative direction and planned development as a failure on the part of the states to fully recognize their basic responsibilities in this area.

In addition to LSCA there are, of course, other Federal support measures for libraries, but they are primarily adjuncts to programs and services directed toward other broader objectives. The LSCA is the main Federal support base for public libraries.

THE PATTERN AND LEVELS OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL FISCAL SUPPORT

Current data showing the amount and percentage of fiscal support for all public libraries are not readily available. The most recent national data on public library support showing the relative Federal, state and local fiscal support were collected for the year 1968. At that, the data are partial, showing only the relative amounts and percentages for public libraries serving jurisdictions of 25,000 or more population. In the 13 states which support libraries most generously, the amounts of state support ranged from \$7 million in New York to little more than \$300,000 in South Carolina. (See Table II.) As a percentage of total expenditure for public libraries in these jurisdictions, the proportion of state support ranged from almost 19 percent in Pennsylvania to 4.4 percent in Michigan. (See Table I.) (Hawaii is excluded because it provides service on a state basis.) On a per capita basis, the amounts ranged from 54¢ in New York to 14¢ in South Carolina. (See Table III.) These data show on a national basis that Federal support is minuscule (3 percent), state support is most modest (6 percent), and that local support is major (83 percent). Also, the remaining support (endowments, gifts, fines, fees, etc.), represented only about 8 percent.

¹¹ Douglas M. Knight and E. Shepley Nourse, *Libraries at Large*, R. R. Bowker, New York, 1969, p. 405.

¹² Ralph Blasingame and Ernest R. DeProspero, Jr., "Effectiveness in Cooperation and Consolidation in Public Libraries," in Melvin J. Voight, *Advances in Librarianship*, I, New York, Academic Press, 1970, p. 194.

TABLE I.—PERCENTAGE OF OPERATING FUNDS BY SOURCE FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES SERVING AT LEAST 25,000 INHABITANTS 1968—SELECTED STATES

State	Percent operating receipts from		
	State government	Local government	Federal Government
Hawaii	99.0	0	11.0
Pennsylvania	18.7	62.8	4.4
Maryland	14.7	78.6	3.2
South Carolina	13.1	70.6	11.8
New Jersey	12.9	78.6	4.1
North Carolina	11.3	71.1	9.3
New York	10.9	67.3	1.6
Florida	7.3	73.1	3.1
Illinois	6.3	87.1	0
Rhode Island	4.9	61.2	0
Massachusetts	4.6	90.3	.8
Montana	4.4	92.7	0
Michigan	4.4	82.5	1.3
Aggregate United States	5.9	83.1	2.6

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics, "Statistics of Public Libraries Serving at Least 25,000 Inhabitants—1968," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1970.

TABLE II.—RECEIPTS INTO OPERATING FUNDS BY SOURCE FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES SERVING AT LEAST 25,000 INHABITANTS, 1968—SELECTED STATES

State	Operating fund receipts from		
	State government	Local government	Federal Government
New York	\$7,072,531	43,767,783	1,061,798
Pennsylvania	3,965,308	13,796,816	958,146
Hawaii	2,506,580	0	308,497
New Jersey	2,373,296	14,498,085	765,635
Maryland	2,211,623	11,854,951	403,776
Illinois	1,264,691	16,183,102	0
Michigan	862,227	16,055,415	257,285
Massachusetts	824,833	16,018,573	138,060
Florida	657,166	6,537,134	274,461
North Carolina	644,342	4,014,129	527,019
California	439,808	63,465,522	754,509
Missouri	431,071	10,631,850	456,785
South Carolina	316,565	1,707,569	286,220
Aggregate United States	25,493,389	359,067,898	11,234,374

Source: See table I.

TABLE III.—PER CAPITA STATE AID AND TOTAL OPERATING RECEIPTS PER CAPITA TO PUBLIC LIBRARIES SERVING AT LEAST 25,000 INHABITANTS, 1968—SELECTED STATES

State	State aid per capita	Total operating receipts per capita
New York	\$0.54	\$4.98
Pennsylvania	.43	2.34
Hawaii	3.96	4.45
New Jersey	.55	4.26
Maryland	.74	5.03
Illinois	.23	3.36
Michigan	.15	3.43
Massachusetts	.25	5.32
Florida	.19	1.14
North Carolina	.16	1.42
California	.03	4.60
Missouri	.14	4.00
South Carolina	.14	1.07

Source: See table I.

It was reported in the 1972 PAS study that 35 states currently authorize some form of fiscal support for local libraries, but that not all of these states appropriate funds for such programs. The report listed 23 states which had made appropriations in 1970-71 totaling \$52.5 million and ranging from \$15.5 million in New York to \$100,000 in Idaho. The type of grant program for these 23 states is also described. (See Table IV.)

TABLE VI.—APPROPRIATIONS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY STATE¹

State	Type of program	1970-71 appropriation
Alabama	Matching grants; extension of service grants.	\$325,400
Arkansas	Establishment grants; continuing support and maintenance grants.	427,000
California	Per capita formula; system establishment grants; development and extension grants.	1,000,000
Colorado	Continuing support and maintenance grants to individual and area libraries; development of statewide reference programs; grants for developing systems.	600,000
Connecticut	Matching grants on a per capita basis.	666,000
Florida	Operating, equalization, and establishment grants.	500,000
Georgia	Basic operating expenses for State-supported local libraries.	2,921,088
Hawaii	All library service is State funded.	
Idaho	Per capita and construction grants; establishment grants; grants to develop new and cooperative services.	100,000
Illinois	Equalization; grants to establish reference centers; grants for the establishment of cooperative library systems.	6,897,093
Kentucky	General grants to county libraries meeting requirements.	217,580
Maryland	Per capita grants for operating expenses (requiring 70 percent local support); construction grants of 50 cents per capita.	3,529,563
Massachusetts	Direct subsidy grants; systems development funding.	4,202,000
Minnesota	Establishment and library materials grants; special development funds; per capita support.	517,500
Missouri	Per capita grants; equalization; establishment funding; continuing support (at least 1 mill local support required).	403,894
New Jersey	Regional service development grants.	6,013,105
New York	Formation, development, and support of library systems.	15,500,000
North Carolina	Operating cost grants.	2,060,000
Ohio	Area service library systems support grants.	366,009
Pennsylvania	Operating grants to regional centers, district centers, and local libraries.	4,029,634
Rhode Island	Per capita grants to cities and towns; building and construction grants; regional center development grants.	536,173
South Carolina	Supplement support for regional and county libraries.	478,519
Tennessee	Operating cost grants; support for regional library centers.	641,700
Virginia	Support of regional, county, and municipal libraries.	600,000

¹ "Patterns Among the States for Supporting Public Library Services," Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1972, p. 16.

This brief analysis of public financing patterns yields a number of conclusions:

- (1) The great bulk of the fiscal support for public libraries rests with local government.

- (2) The level of state support is significant in a few states but is nominal in most states. This indicates that, however well states have responded to the LSCA stimulus, they have not yet taken seriously the charge of insuring the development of an adequate pattern of public library services in all jurisdictions.

- (3) The nature and objective of operative state support programs vary widely, ranging from straight per capita grants to formula based equalization grants for general operating purposes.

THE CHANGING SCENE: A REVIEW OF CURRENT PROBLEMS

Much of the literature of the public library field is peculiarly defensive and introspective. There seems to be a discernible orientation toward discussion of survival issues ranging from philosophic questions centered on a validation of the role of librarian in today's world, to pragmatic issues of funding, with heavier emphasis on the former.

There is, of course, a logical explanation for this defensive posture. From the point of view of the traditional functions performed by the public library, it is indeed a rapidly changing world. Declining readership, especially in the cities; wide-spread development and utilization of new media forms; changed sometimes polarized, cultural and educational interests; the metropolitan birth-place of the library, a racial, economic and political battleground—all of these changing forces and influences challenge the role, sometimes the existence, of the public library.

Nonetheless, this explanation does not seem fully adequate. Other governmental institutions are similarly threatened and faced with the need to change. Public education, for example, is today a virtual battleground. And while we face in this field financial crises, teacher strikes, racial upheavals, and basic questions posed by the studies of Coleman, Jencks, and Jensen about effectiveness and worth, no one talks seriously about complete elimination of the public education system.

Perhaps a more valid explanation is that there exists a lack of full recognition and acceptance of public libraries as a viable function in the mainstream of government. A host of reasons and contributing factors can be advanced in support of this view. This explanation is perhaps less germane in the major cities where technical, functional, and fiscal operating problems prevail. But even in the big cities public libraries have a relatively low political and governmental visibility. It is doubtful that the director of libraries of any major city sits regularly as a member of the Mayor's Cabinet, or as ex-officio member of the local school board. The same circumstances exist at the state level where boards and commissions serve to insulate the public library function from direct accountability to the chief elected official or head of the department to which public library administration is assigned. Such politically insulated structure is never an unmixed blessing because lack of full accountability upwards means usually a lack of felt responsibility downward. Also, there is something less than a full, formal bureaucracy to sustain and support the public library mission and survival is the unstated, but, nevertheless, top priority mission of any bureaucracy.

While these general observations may serve to explain the current scene, they are not intended to deny the existence, nor understate the importance of current public library problems. A summary of important current and continuing problems of the field follows.

1. Lack of performance standards

The American Library Association (ALA) has responded to the challenges of change by promulgating standards of service for many different classes of libraries. These standards are partly descriptive of present practice, and partly prescriptive in establishing goals regarding the level and type of services to be made available. Some standards are quantitative goals for "minimum" levels of inputs. For example, public library systems satisfy the standard if they have "at least one currently published periodical title . . . for each 250 people in the service area."

Unfortunately, library standards as presently formulated are not really designed to guide and make possible the measurement of performance. The standards have been established with no apparent empirical foundations, nor are there criteria indicating priorities. If some standards are exceeded while others are not met, can any statements be made concerning the overall performance of the library? Probably not.

Furthermore, standards refer basically to levels of inputs instead of levels of output, the latter being the real concern of library administrators. Merely meeting the standards implies, perhaps falsely, that the library is doing an adequate job. Some observers have the view that standards are used too frequently to justify and support increases in a library's budget. That is an important use, but they should also guide and stimulate improved performance.

The development of public library performance measures is viewed as one of the most critical problems facing the library profession today. Such measures are especially difficult to construct due to the inability of the library profession to define objectives precisely and the inability to define or measure the output of library service. As one expert observer notes: "Assuming that libraries do get promptly about the business of clearly defining functions, collectively and individually, it will still be obviously out of the question for the individual library to develop standard measurements of library use which, with the exception of circulation counts, simply do not now exist."¹³

2. The public library's role in question

The question of purpose or function is fundamental for current and future planning for public libraries. At the present time there is a great deal of discussion centering on what the public library's future role should be. Should it

¹³ S. Gilbert Prentiss, "The State Overview: The State as a Collector of Library Statistics," in David C. Palmer, ed., *A National Plan for Library Statistics: Guidelines for Implementation*, Chicago, Statistics Coordinating Committee of the ALA, 1970, p. 31.

continue in the traditional manner of trying to serve the diverse educational, cultural, and recreational needs of a wide variety of possible patrons, or should it attempt to define these needs more narrowly, providing better service for a smaller class of clientele? And what types of services can libraries provide which might not be available elsewhere at similar or less costs? Public libraries must answer these questions because across the nation, especially in cities, attendance and use of public libraries appears to be declining. The reasons for this decline may be difficult to determine, but part of the decline is probably due to competition for the public's attention from alternative sources, such as paperback books, magazines and newspapers, television, and school libraries. Spiraling costs and a proliferation of printed material have created a situation in which public libraries must carefully choose which document and program resources to develop and how they should allocate their scarce funds. The conclusion of at least one researcher is that the public library should stop trying to satisfy everybody for everything.¹⁴

One alternative is to provide a narrower range of services not easily obtained elsewhere. Some public libraries have experimented with new forms of service, acting in certain instances like a Sears catalog-type distribution center. Other services may be limited to information on daily living, provision of work space and materials for students, presentation of new media items, and exploration of issues currently important to the community. The logical target population primarily would be the poor.

3. *The problem of meeting different needs*

The role of public libraries or, more precisely, the need for such services, particularly in metropolitan areas and urban centers, is apparently changing and becoming quite differentiated. As one governmental issue paper puts it:

Transactions of both print and non-print media showed a 12 percent decline nationwide, decreasing from 634,624,000 transactions in 1965 to 560,214,022 in 1968. The only increase in number of patron transactions occurred in the smaller cities (25,000-34,999) which showed a 6 percent increase. The decline was greatest (16 percent) in the largest communities, those having a population of 100,000 and over; in communities with a population of 50,000 to 99,000, the decline was 8 percent; and in communities of 25,000 to 49,000, the decline was a mere 1 percent.¹⁵

The change in this measure of demand would appear to be quite significant—not only is the utilization of library services decreasing nationally, the decrease is disproportionate in the large cities where public libraries originated and have their longest tradition of service. Other findings presented in the paper demonstrate in the case of Baltimore and several other larger cities that while book circulation and number of borrowers have decreased over the past three years in the central city libraries, there were substantial increases in these activity figures in the adjacent and nearby suburban communities. Demographic and migration data are offered to explain these changes in part, but the implications for library support fiscal policy are clear. If these changes reflect a need for different kinds of library services as between core cities and suburban and rural areas, if this pattern is generic to most or all metropolitan areas, and if the different services required vary markedly in nature and cost factors, then clearly library fiscal policies and mechanisms might require major adjustments and revisions to insure that differential needs are supported and met equitably in all jurisdictions.

The problem of marked differences in core city and suburban public library utilization is compounded by the fact that expenditures for the diminishing services of core city libraries are, nonetheless, increasing significantly. The Issue Paper, previously mentioned, points out that per capita expenditures of library systems serving populations over 100,000 doubled from 1960 to 1968. The increased costs may reflect expanded efforts of urban libraries as they seek to meet new challenges and new service needs. They also may reflect the more or less fixed expenditure patterns of library bureaucracies whose traditional services are increasing in cost, but not in relevance for meeting the needs of core city residents. In either event, hard-pressed city budget administrators and executives are likely to require more justification for their support of these services, or to reduce budgets accordingly. The role of state and Federal fiscal policies and mechanisms in this kind of situation seems clear. They should provide leadership and guide-

¹⁴ Thomas Childers, "Community and Library: Some Possible Futures," *Library Journal*, Vol. 98, No. 16, pp. 2727-2730 (Sept. 15, 1971).

¹⁵ Kathleen Molz, "The Federal Role in Support of Public Libraries, Issue Paper: USOE draft 2/18/72, pp. 9-10 (unpublished).

lines for local government officials to follow in the support of public libraries, and, to the maximum extent possible, provide a flow of funds which can best assist and match local fiscal effort.

4. *The problem of differing ability to support services*

The question of who should pay for library service is also critical in today's scene. The need for library service and the ability to pay for such services are not distributed uniformly across the nation or even across an individual state. A relatively poor jurisdiction has greater difficulty raising sufficient tax revenue to support adequate library service. Such a district is poor, among other reasons, because of its restricted tax base and, frequently, because of higher overall municipal service costs. The issue of municipal overburden is rarely resolved by current library subsidy mechanisms and fiscal inequities in providing basic services, including libraries, continue to exist.

Equalization of resources has been recognized as a challenge which faces most aid and subsidy systems. In the 1969 Report of the Office of Education's Library Planning Group, one of the four goals for library development was "to provide greater equalization of State and local resources for Library programs and services." At the State level, the ALA established the standard that "State financial aid for libraries should equalize resources and services across the state by providing extra help for those least able to finance sound services and facilities."¹⁰

5. *Constitutional issues and fiscal support*

Local governments, particularly urban jurisdictions, are facing financial crises of major proportions as they seek to provide funds for essential services. As previously indicated, experienced observers are already citing the limitations of general and special revenue sharing to relieve the increasing financial strain at the local level. Further, the *Rodriguez v. Texas* case, based on the Serrano-Priest issue, recently decided by the U.S. Supreme Court, and the many similar cases in the various States have raised basic constitutional questions related to the use of local taxable wealth as a determinant in the fiscal support of public education. The Supreme Court in the *Rodriguez* case decided that the issue should be resolved by state legislatures rather than by the judicial agency, on constitutional grounds. The Court, however, gave added legitimacy to the issue. This fact, plus a strong dissenting decision of four of the Justices, suggests strongly that the issue will have to be resolved at either the legislative or judicial levels. Resolution of this issue is likely to have a spill-over effect on State-local fiscal relations in the support of other essential services for which the State bears primary legislative responsibility, such as public libraries. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science in recognizing this critical problem argues that if the current method of funding public schools is changed, library funding must change too. Their reasoning is that it would be "unfair" to have schools operating on a broad-based tax structure and libraries controlled by a more restrictive tax base.

6. *What is an adequate basis, level and distribution scheme for fiscal support?*

It is true that public libraries receive a low level of fiscal support compared to other governmental services provided by State and local governments. Public library expenditures in FY 70 amounted to only .5 percent of all state and local governmental expenditures. This fact, however, provides little by way of demonstrable evidence to determine whether the percentage is low, high or about right. Moreover, cursory examination of data indicates that over a ten-year period 1957-1967, the increase in expenditures for local public libraries has kept pace fairly consistently with increases in other local government expenditures. Analysis of data for later years confirms this judgment, but does not provide any additional justification as to what the rate should be.

Perhaps a better indication that public library expenditures are low, and are inefficiently distributed is provided by a quite recent study of state library policy. The researchers correlated state appropriations per capita for direct library programs with a whole series of variables including percent change in urban population, personal income, state and local revenues from property taxes, state general revenue totals, and other political, economic and demographic factors. The correlation coefficients were quite low for the series—the highest for any of

¹⁰ American Library Association, *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level* (Revision of the 1963 edition), Chicago, 1970.

the specific variables identified above was an "r" of -0.354 , a value which accounted for only 12 percent of the total variance. The authors conclude: "These low correlations suggest that State spending for library programs is largely unrestrained by the economic, social, or political circumstances existing in the State. So far as these measures are concerned, any of the fifty states is in just as good a position as any of the other states to receive either the highest or lowest appropriations."¹⁷ While the authors did not attempt to reach causative conclusions, it is possible at least that library expenditures are at such low level as to be unaffected by "economic, social or political circumstances" which, normally, would be expected to exhibit a higher statistical relationship to these data. Moreover, if variations in these expenditures among the states are a product of chance, or the operation of unknown, unrelated factors, the further judgment is suggested that there is a lack of consistent fiscal policy and policy mechanisms among the States in support of public libraries. This kind of judgment, if valid, should, of course, be a matter of serious concern to the Congress, Federal, state and local officials and administrators whose responsibilities include the continuous development of adequate public library services in all parts of the nation.

Further indication of both inconsistency and inefficiency in state fiscal policies and, equally important, the lack of meaningful relationships between Federal and state fiscal policies in support of public libraries is suggested by another finding of the study. Efforts to correlate per capita Federal grant obligations in FY 1967 with variables representing state resource characteristics and library program standards also produce quite low coefficients of correlation. The researchers concluded: "Neither State resources nor library programs have meaningful impact upon the distribution of Federal aid to the states."¹⁸ Intergovernmental fiscal policies in any functional area should exhibit some degree of meshing and inter-responsiveness if they seek to achieve common goals. The fact that these analyses demonstrated only moderate or low correlation may be significant evidence that Federal and state fiscal policies and mechanisms have little co-responsiveness in providing support for public library services. The fact that Federal and state funds provide only a small percentage of local public library expenditures further highlights the need for greater consistency in Federal and state fiscal policies. Under such conditions it is essential that Federal and state funds, together, be utilized strategically to fill service gaps and provide incentives designed to optimize the expenditure of local funds.

7. Balance among the sources of funding

The question of a fair-share formula specifying an "equitable" division of financial support among the local, state and Federal levels has been debated for at least twenty years. In their report prepared for the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, the Nelson Associates urged that fair-share formulas be developed and argued systematically. They report: "The development and general acceptance of a 'fair-share' formula is one of the important items of business on the library agenda."¹⁹ Opinions on this subject have varied a great deal. In 1948, Amy Winslow and Carleton Joeckel proposed a formula for public library support of 60% local, 25% state and 15% Federal. As part of an Allerton Park Institute in 1961, Hannis Smith proposed the formula: 40% local, 40% state, and 20% Federal support. In 1964 Lowell Martin considered that a reasonable formula would be 50% local, 30% state, and 20% Federal support. These proposals and opinions are in sharp contrast to the present support pattern reported for FY 1970, which is approximately 88 percent local, 7 percent state, and 5 percent Federal. Clearly, there is no consensus concerning an appropriate distribution of public library cost among levels of government. Decisions relating to this distribution continue to be made on a highly decentralized and independent basis by the different levels of government. The amount of support each provides is the result of political, economic, and social factors in the absence of guidelines reflecting total library service needs and providing adequate bases for cost distribution.

Public libraries today are thus confronted with many challenges. Financially strapped, struggling to compete with more glamorous forms of information sources, sometimes attacked as "irrelevant" by their own users, libraries must

¹⁷ *State Library Policy: Its Legislative and Environmental Contexts*. St. Angelo, Hartsfield, Goldstein, American Library Assoc., Chicago, 1971, p. 30.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

¹⁹ Nelson Associates, Inc., *Public Libraries in the United States: Trends, Problems, and Recommendations*, report prepared for the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, 1967, p. 24.

face these challenges squarely if the institution is to respond adequately. The problems are many, the solutions difficult, but the ability to respond to change and improve service has been a tradition in the history of public libraries.

THE FUTURE SCENE

In an ending section of a recent appraisal of state library policy, the authors state:

The overall conclusions on the materials presented in this chapter are both surprising and delightful. Much of the previous work on general state policy has suggested a social or economic determinism. For example, some research has stressed that extensive state education programs require favorable social and economic environments. The analysis of this chapter clearly implies that good state library programs are an act of *free will*. A state does not have to have a highly favorable economic or social environment before it can develop a leading library program. Moreover, there are no particular political configurations which favor library programs. Strong library programs can exist in any of our state political environments. In a reaffirmation in the faith of the ability of man, these data say that good library programs are the result of leadership.²⁰ (Emphasis added)

The ebullient optimism reflected in this conclusion should be viewed with great caution. A less sanguine reading of the statement, and the data on which it is based, is that top political leaders and forces in this country do not care all that much about public libraries and public library development. No one's ox is being gored; let the institution continue to dangle on the periphery of the social and governmental scene; libraries were once supported by private largesse, let them continue to survive on the bits and pieces of government fiscal surplus. Probably it is true that neither view is an accurate and complete portrayal of future options, the authors, after all, were mainly commenting on the need for leadership and the apparent latitude within which leadership can operate.

But, what of the future? What evidence is now available to depict the environment in which public libraries will operate? Will they continue to have a role as a societal civilizing force? Definitive answers to those questions are not within the constraints of this paper, but a basic affirmative or negative answer with respect to future roles is fundamental to governmental financing. A listing of relevant, current and projected data include the following items:²¹

1. Population

A population leveling-off at almost 205 million in 1970, with birth rate declining from 27/1000 in the 1950's to 18/1000 today, and death rate declining even more markedly.

Life expectancy at 70 years, 23 years longer than 1900.

A current annual growth rate of 1.1 percent, adding 2.25 million to our society each year.

Females outnumbering males by 5.5 million in 1970.

Twenty-six million (12.5 percent) members of minority races in 1970, up 5 million from 1960.

One-half the population under 28 years and one-sixth over 65.

An expected 33 percent increase in annual household formation, in smaller family units.

2. Urbanization

Seventy percent of the 1970 population in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

Increasing metropolitan growth from 1960 to 1970, at double the U.S. rate of growth.

Nearly all metropolitan growth taking place in the suburbs.

Twelve areas with populations of over 2 million, and 132 cities of over 100,000.

The metropolitan population concentrated on less than 1 percent of the nation's land area.

Seventy-eight percent of all Blacks living in central cities.

²⁰ St. Angelo, Hartsfield and Goldstein, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

²¹ Data developed from a review of various sources including three primary references: *Population and the American Future*, Report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972; Conrad Tauber, "Population: Trends and Characteristics" in *Indicators of Social Change*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1968, and *Pocket Data Book, USA*, U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1971.

3. Education

A decline in the number of illiterates.

Thirty-three percent of persons over 25 years with 12 or more years of school completed in 1970, more than double the 1940 proportion.

Median year of school completed 12.1 years in 1969, up from 9.3 years in 1950.

Dramatic increases in school enrollment of 18-24 year olds, 78 percent in 1970.

Four times the number of Bachelor Degrees in 1969, compared to 1940; more than seven times the number of Master's Degrees, and eight times the number of Doctorates.

4. Labor Force and Occupations

Ninety million in the labor force, 74 million in non-agricultural jobs.

Increases in the percentage of professional and technical workers, managers, clerks, service oriented jobs and government workers.

Decline in unskilled manual workers.

Forty-two percent of female population in the labor force and increasing. 4.5 million out of work and seeking jobs.

5. The Economy

A GNP of \$724 billion in 1970, up almost 50 percent over 1960 (1958 dollars).

Personal income up about 8.5 percent, 1972 over 1971.

Median family income of almost \$9,600 in 1970 compared to \$5,700 in 1960.

A decrease of 15 million in the total number of people below the poverty level, 1959 to 1969, and an even greater percentage decrease in this number for Blacks.

A greater incidence of poverty in non-metropolitan areas.

A 12 percent increase in spending on durable goods, and an 8 percent increase for non-durable goods and services in 1972.

6. Leisure Time

During 1960-1970, workers gained 50 hours per year in free time, added 15 hours of vacation time, 4 hours to holidays and reduced by 31 hours the time spent working.

A 1960-1970 increase of 100 percent in money spent on all forms of recreation.

A prediction that by the year 2000, retirement at age 38 will be commonplace.

One could extend this brief list of facts, factors and projections of the future. But the list seems to provide more than enough evidence to indicate a future society featuring more of everything—including problems. The data project a society in which the pace of knowledge, skill, economic activity and human relationships is on the ascendancy. The ways in which we are able to guide, control and direct these dynamic forces will determine whether wisdom and the sustaining qualities of the good-life, are also on the ascendancy. But most certainly, it is a future world requiring high responsibility and commitment to sustaining and expanding the basic sources of information and knowledge which are the ingredients of the social wisdom required. As David Bell points out, the distinguishing features of our time which sets it off from the past are the acceleration of the rate of information, the "idea of exponential growth curves," the change of scale in our daily lives, and the number of persons each one of us knows which has altered the way in which we experience the world. These changes naturally cause "structural differentiation", consequences which include:

1. The creation of a service economy;
2. The pre-eminence of the professional and technical class;
3. The centrality of theoretical knowledge as the source of innovation and policy formulation in the society;
4. The possibility of self-sustaining technological growth; and

Whether the reality of the future will reflect accurately Bell's predictions cannot be known with surety. What can be known with surety, is the present need to sustain and enhance public libraries as an accessible storehouse of public knowledge vital to achieving desirable future goals for the whole of society.

5. The creation of a new "intellectual technology".²²

²² Bell, David, "The Measurement of Knowledge and Technology," in *Indicators of Social Change*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1968, p. 41.

III. A SUMMARY OF BASIC ISSUES

Our federal system is usually described as a partnership of the Federal, state and local levels of government. The powers and duties of the Federal government are expressly stated in the Constitution. All powers not delegated to the Federal level, except those specifically denied by the Constitution, are left to the states for performance and implementation. Local governments, of whatever form, are creatures of the state and are charged with performance of responsibilities and functions expressly delegated to them by statute or, under a broader, more generalized grant of power, by state authorized home rule charter provisions.

Strict constructionists of the Constitution and other observers argue, with respect to public library services and development that no Federal role exists. The facts are, however, that the Federal government has been instrumental in launching and sustaining hundreds of domestic programs and fiscal support measures in a wide variety of functional areas and likely will continue to do so. A much higher degree of consensus exists in support of the principle that prime responsibility for public library services belongs at the state level. Clearly, the state is the most theoretically and strategically appropriate level of government to insure the provision of adequate public library services for all citizens. It follows, then, that the state has the latitude for utilizing local government in whatever ways it may deem appropriate in developing public library services.

This nice, pat description of the division of responsibilities and duties with respect to public libraries is by no means an accurate portrayal of how the system works. John Rebout characterizes governmental operations as a whole web of intergovernmental relations focused on key principles essential to make the partnership viable including the goal of equality of opportunity in all jurisdictions, the irrelevance of jurisdictional boundaries in many instances, the existence of governments with widely varying fiscal capacities, recognition of the special problems of metropolitan areas, and the need for new regional organizational arrangements. As he stated:

If these principles are not fully realized in practice, they at least characterize a concept of American federalism that seems to be emerging. I have been calling it "partnership" federalism. Others have called it "cooperative," "creative," or "new" federalism. President Lyndon B. Johnson's expression "creative federalism" suggests the dynamic qualities inherent in its pluralism and the capacity, it is hoped, to fuse a multiplicity of local initiatives and energies in building the national purpose and strength needed for survival in an age of unprecedented complexity and fluidity.

Librarians and their cohorts need to understand these concepts if they are to play a significant role in this venture. The federal partnership is not a company of saints vying with one another to make sacrifice for the common good. The playing field is rough. The rules are complicated, changeable, and sometimes contradictory. The goals are often obscure, the goalkeepers frequently anonymous, and the rewards uncertain. It is no game for the weak, the timorous, or the uninformed. It is being played for the common good, however variously that common good may be understood by the players. Libraries should have much to contribute to the clarification of goals and the knowledge of the rules by which a civilized society must live and evolve.²¹

In this context, issues relevant to the governmental financing of public library services must be viewed in a broad perspective, inclusive of, but also beyond, the analysis of the various formulae and methods now used to provide governmental fiscal support. Accordingly, this definition and explication of issues confronting the governmental financing of public library services includes questions about role, function, and structure of public library services, as well as basic issues concerning the source, level and method of governmental financing.

1. *There is need to sharpen the definition of, and to achieve broader consensus on, the role and function of the public library.*

So much appears in the literature in lengthy discussions of the public library's role that one hesitates to identify the role question as a basic issue in the governmental financing of such services. Nonetheless, it seems clear that adequate, sustaining public financing systems for these services are not likely to emerge without better definitions, supported by a broader consensus, of the scope, pur-

²¹ John E. Rebout, "Partnership Federalism" in *The Metropolitan Library*, edited by Ralph W. Conant and Kathleen Melz, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1972, p. 79.

poses and functions, in priority array, of public library services. A recent research effort catalogued some 30 somewhat overlapping but different statements describing public library objectives. An excellent general definition is the one provided by Shera:

What then, one may properly ask, is the purpose of the public library? To answer such a question it is necessary to look first at the generic role of the library, what the library can and should do and what no other agency in society does, or at least can do as well. The function of the library, regardless of its nature or clientele, should be to maximize the social utility of graphic records for the benefit of the individual and, through the individual, of society. The library, as a social invention, was brought into being because graphic records are essential to the development and progress of culture; hence, it is important that the citizen have access to those resources that will best enable him to operate effectively in his several roles as a member of society. The public library, as its name implies, has been predicated on the assumption that it could meet this objective for all strata of the population.²⁸

There are a number of pre-conditions and parameters which should be considered in examining the role issue.

(a) *Political acceptability and accountability.*—The fundamental purpose of role and function definition is to win, both within and outside the professional library field, political and fiscal support for the program. Increasingly, in the highly competitive fields of public and voluntary finance, needed support can no longer be achieved on the basis of highly generalized goal statements, however noble. Budget and fiscal decision makers want to know specifically *what* the fund-seeking agency is going to do; *how* are they going to do it; and above all, *how* they will measure and evaluate the costs and benefits of the proposed activities. Thus, the task of role and function definition should stimulate and guide the determination of measurable objectives and performance standards based on output measures. This should permit continuing evaluation to demonstrate program impact and the achievement of purpose. Planning-programming-budgeting systems in all areas of government are still evolving; libraries and library systems cannot be expected to go beyond the current state-of-the-art in this area. Nonetheless, the basic concept of accountability and measurement of performance against quantifiable objectives is not likely to go away. Public libraries must come to terms with this requirement of modern public financing systems.

(b) *Public libraries as a single and separate entity.* As previously discussed, the public library is a unique social institution. The literature of the field provides evidence that the institution to some extent thinks of itself as separate and apart from all other community, social, cultural and educational agencies. To the extent that this feeling exists, it should be examined critically. Society has a history of responding with only an elusive and partial commitment to those social institutions which aspire to transcendent qualities. Bebout puts it well:

Public libraries that are worth their salt are no longer the somewhat cloistered institutions of local cultural benevolence that many of them once were . . . As institutions, however, they are caught in a vast web of governmental organizations and practices—national, state, local—that has come to be called partnership federalism. The nation is just beginning to become aware of the complex system of intergovernmental relationships that has evolved out of the relatively simple concept of federalism embodied in the Constitution of 1787. Libraries, quantitatively miniscule elements in the system, have hardly sensed the implication of this evolution for either their institutional integrity or their function in society.²⁹

In defining their role and function then, libraries face the need to see themselves as an integral part of a fabric of institutions serving the same or closely related goals. They should consider providing and seeking active support of such agencies. Finally, they should be willing to negotiate with other social and educational agencies in determining their role and function as it relates to a total pattern of community, social, cultural and educational services.

(c) *Relationship to government.* In working at the task of defining role and function, library professionals have the option of pressing for the inclusion of

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

²⁹ Jesse H. Shera, "The Public Library in Perspective" in *The Metropolitan Library*, edited by Ralph W. Conant and Kathleen Molz, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1972, p. 106.

public library services as viable programs in the mainstream of governmental operations at whatever level. Perhaps because of their private philanthropic origins and their functional nature, there is some evidence that public libraries are considered almost quasi-governmental in nature. The implications of this observation, to the extent it is valid, on structure and finance will be discussed later. From an overall fiscal support point of view, there may be some advantages to a peripheral position in the developmental stages of a new institution requiring funding. However, these advantages are likely to diminish, or even become liabilities, as the institution becomes of age and requires full, consistent funding at adequate levels of support. In any event, this paper accepts and supports the premise that there exists a profound and increasing need for the services and programs which public libraries can provide. There seems to be little doubt or disagreement that the administration and fiscal support of such activities should flow from government. The goal in seeking "mainstream" status simply accents the need for full responsibility, commitment and funding on the part of the appropriate governmental level, or levels.

(d) *Relationship to public education.* As Kathleen Molz has put it in an historical context:

The public library, then, was viewed as the last and most independent stage in a hierarchical system of public education that began with the enrollment of the nation's children in the public schools.²⁸

Review of the literature suggests that the relationship of public libraries to public education is still under discussion and debate and that, to a large extent, the phrase "most independent stage" is an apt characterization of the relationship which now exists.

It seems clear that in defining and sharpening the conception of role, function and mission, public library professionals must come to more specific terms with questions of organizational, functional and fiscal relationships with public educational systems at all levels of government. This would be no easy marriage to broker under the best conditions, and today's scene in both functional areas is turbulent. Public education has been earlier described as a battleground, and so it is; but it is a battleground in which all the important governmental and political forces are deeply involved and committed to resolution. A substantial part of the struggle in public education, perhaps not as visible as the fiscal, reflects the dynamic forces of basic change which are beginning to become operative. Public education is a highly compartmentalized, bureaucratized governmental institution which is now receiving severe criticism for performance failure and its lack of full relevance to basic societal needs. There is evidence, however, that public education is breaking out of its restraining concepts and rigid forms. The goals of public education are under scrutiny. Hopefully, they will be broadened to reflect a concern for the quality of life, a concern that emphasizes the "sensitivity" about which Molz has spoken in *The Metropolitan Library*. To the extent that these changes emerge there would seem to be an even greater need for strong, functional linkages between the public education and public library systems.

2. *The structure through which public library services are developed and administered at the local and state governmental levels needs to be re-examined and strengthened.*

Within certain limits, the structure through which governmental programs are supported and implemented can be considered a variable. There are few hard and fast rules in public administration and organizational theory to define in precise terms which structural form should be used to insure programmatic success. Chances are that if public libraries were receiving adequate fiscal support and were not an endangered species, this paper, if it were written at all, would not deal with the question of structure. Such is not the case. Moreover, there is some relationship between how well an institution is fiscally supported and its structural form; and there are some fundamental, empirically based rules against which structural form should be examined and evaluated.

(a) *Service-providing vs. administrative agencies.* An earlier discussion in this paper commented on the fundamental differences in orientation, mission, personnel and operational mode between a service-providing agency and one charged with administrative direction and development of a governmental program. Yet, the observable pattern in the development of public library programs and services seems to feature placement of responsibility in the state library.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

The literature of the field tends to blur the distinction being made here. For example, the discussion in *Libraries at Large* on American State Libraries and State Library Agencies under the caption "Role of the State Library" is as follows:

The role of the state in library functions has been defined as follows: States provide library services directly, promote services through other agencies, coordinate the various library measures, aid libraries financially and require service through Standards and Regulations.²⁷

The point to be made is that the "role of the state" and the "role of the state library" with respect to library services development should not be considered synonymous. For reasons already cited, the establishment of a state library and the development of public library services throughout the state are historically and organizationally related. In many states, the state library remains as the agency principally responsible for all of the functions in the definition cited above. ALA's *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level* fails to honor or otherwise comment on the distinction being made here when it states:

Various types of libraries and agencies have been established by the states to carry out library functions. In this document, the term *state library agency* refers to the appropriate unit of government responsible for the function specified in each standard.²⁸

It is suggested that this question needs to be dealt with directly in postulating the future development of public library services at the level and to the extent desired. Aggressive administrative direction and development of public library services in all jurisdictions of state are not likely to emerge from the agency responsible for providing services to a state capital clientele. The orientations are too different. Titles are, in some sense, only as important as the incumbents make them, but the distinction between the titles "State Librarian" and "State Director of Public Library Services" connotes vast differences. One wonders about the difference in growth and developmental patterns that might have ensued if the LSCA had included as a prerequisite to receiving federal funds, the appointment of a director of public library services in each state and outlined his duties in broad terms.

(b) *The use of administrative boards and commissions.* The use of a plural executive, in the form of a board or commission vested with administrative responsibilities, is commonly viewed as a weak and inefficient organizational form. This observation has recognized validity even in school district organizations, regardless of whether board members are appointed or elected, or whether they have direct taxing power. In cities particularly, the board-dominated organizational structure is increasingly called into question. In Philadelphia, for example, current efforts to revise the home rule charter include discussion of the alternative of assigning responsibility for school operation to the Mayor as one of the departments of the City government. It is widely recognized that the recent extended teachers strike could not have been settled without the direct, sustained involvement of the Mayor of Philadelphia.

The PAS study points out that in 25 states responsibility for organizing and administering public library services is vested in an independent committee, commission, or board. In reference to the point made in a., above, the report further states that:

A state librarian or official with a similar title, who may or may not be a voting member of the governing body, is usually responsible for the day-to-day administration of the agency.²⁹

In 14 states, responsibility for coordinating public library services is assigned to the agency which administers public education. In the remaining 11 states, the assignment of responsibility for public libraries varies; in six states, the responsibility is assigned to another department or agency of state government; in three, it is placed in the governor's office; and in two, Indiana and Vermont, it is assigned to a department of libraries.

Clearly, the predominant organizational pattern at the state level features the use of administrative boards and commissions. There are many reasons advanced

²⁷ *Libraries at Large*, edited by Douglas M. Knight and Shepley Nourse, RR Bowker Company, New York, 1969, p. 400.

²⁸ American Library Association, *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level*, (Revision of the 1963 edition), Chicago, 1970, p. 1.

²⁹ *Patterns Among the State for Supporting Public Library Services*, Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1972, p. 18. The numbers of states in each class are taken from a later, updated PAS report: *An Inquiry Into The Patterns Among States for Funding Public Library Service*, pp. 28-29.

to explain the less efficient administrative functioning of plural executive heads. The difficulty of developing aggressive policy, the negotiated (and negotiating) position of the chief executive, rapid turnover of board members, or, on the other hand, little or no turnover of board members—all these are among the reasons which limit the effectiveness of administrative boards. Confirming evidence that board-commission structural patterns do not insure strong fiscal support for the operation is cited in the St. Angelo research on state library policy. The report states:

... at present there is no clear pattern of the best relationship within state government for the highest support of library programs. There is evidence to indicate that agencies now located in state education departments fare somewhat better than other structures maintaining these agencies so far as funds go.³⁰

ALA's *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level* are mute on the subject of the appropriate use of administrative boards and commissions.

To the extent that similar types of board structure are used in the administration of public library programs at the local level, the same kind of difficulties apply. It is reported that in many communities, public libraries are administered by quasi-public, self-perpetuating boards. The inherent policy and administrative limitations of boards are compounded by these added features.

The obvious alternative to be considered in redefining structure is to restrict the use of boards and commissions to an advisory status.

(c) *Permissive versus mandatory state legislation.* The point already has been made that local governments can be utilized by the state, in whatever ways appropriate, to develop local public library services. Local home rule charter provisions represent broader grants of power, but even such measures frequently set constraints and general guidelines for the development of local services. Some observers see local governments primarily as delivery systems for providing basic community services, including library services.

In the light of these basic state-local government relationships, the rather standard use of enabling, state legislation for the development and administration of local public library services should be examined. Typically, state statutes permit local units of governments to establish public libraries and grant authority for their fiscal support, frequently in the form of a prescribed maximum tax rate. The problem of prescribed tax rates will be discussed later. Here, the point is that standard use of permissive legislation provides not much in the way of incentive or urgency for the establishment and aggressive development of local public library services. The historical growth of public library and public education systems has been closely associated. Yet, it is interesting to note that there is little in the way of permissiveness in the state delegation of local public education responsibilities. The reasons for the distinction are obvious. However, it is suggested that the closer states can come to a general *mandate* for development of local public library services, supported by state administrative and fiscal incentives, the sooner such services will be upgraded and expanded.

(d) *The administrative and fiscal viability of regional library network organization.* It has become important as well as fashionable in recent years to press for the regionalization of governmental services in a wide variety of functional areas, including public libraries. There are economic, political and functional reasons that can be advanced to support this developmental trend. Most of such reasons are rooted in the existing constraints and rigidities associated with the unchanging pattern of local jurisdictional boundaries.

Public libraries too, have moved in the direction of regional networks, but progress has been slow in spite of incentive financing measures in some states.

The recent National Commission on Libraries report calls for networks of libraries; certainly the apex of the network, or its clearinghouse/control center, logically should be the state library. But the statement by an outsider—a non-state librarian—is not so effective or meaningful as the same thought voiced by someone with the responsibility for promoting and operating such a network. State librarians, indeed, have pronounced this concept viable; their acceptance of it, however, has not led to any record-breaking speed contest of implementation.³¹

Moves to regionalize other governmental services have also been more active in discussion stages than in specific implementation.

³⁰ St. Angelo, Hartsfield, Goldstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67.

³¹ St. Angelo, Hartsfield, Goldstein, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

While there may be sound justification for the regionalization of public library services, some caution should be stated and observed with respect to the timing and the strategic implementation of regional plans and development. Regional agencies are usually created by negotiation and compromise between levels and among units of government. In embryonic form they frequently lack organizational form, fiscal strength and an active political constituency. Thus, the superimposition of a regional network, with the essential attendant administrative structure, on the existing relatively weak governmental organization for public library services creates some doubt as to its strategic validity. A collection of weak local public libraries operating on the periphery of government does not make for regional organizational strength.

This observation by no means should be interpreted as undermining the library network concept that can be achieved by coordination, required operating relationships, and special fiscal support. But the effective discharge of administrative and developmental responsibility requires an operative political and fiscal base. Moreover, it would seem that proximity of source is perhaps the most vital single factor in establishing and developing general public library services. Regionalization of selected, and specific kinds of information resources may well be more appropriate and defensible in terms of cost-benefit ratios. Given the history and existing status of public libraries in most states, it is difficult to see that a state-wide system of district or regional libraries would add administrative or fiscal strength towards the development of adequate local public library services. Perhaps a significant factor in insuring the administrative effectiveness of regional library networks would be for the state to delegate to the regional agency its full power to implement the development of regional systems. Regional public library agencies should then be held accountable to the state for development progress.

3. *There is a need for systematically researched alternative plans for the distribution of public library costs, at adequate levels of service, among Federal, state and local governments*

Widely varying judgments are expressed in the literature with respect to a desirable or optimum distribution of public library service costs among levels of government. These data, which have been described earlier in this paper, share a common feature in that they all deviate markedly from the present approximate pattern of cost distribution—88 percent local, 7 percent state, and 5 percent Federal. All reported judgments would significantly elevate the percentage of fiscal support from the state and Federal levels.

Review of the Library Services and Construction Act, as amended, provides evidence that the Congress also has expressed itself in terms of a higher Federal fiscal input for public libraries. Witness the \$207 million authorized in the Act for FY 1972, compared to the \$58.6 actually appropriated; and, of course, funds made available under the continuing resolution are significantly below the 1972 level. The authorization—appropriation gap is a problem which extends far beyond the public library field and is a part of the on-going struggle for fiscal power between the Federal legislative and executive branches. The deeper problem is that there seems to be little knowledge available about the total cost of equipping the nation with an adequate pattern of public library services. This is no easy task to perform, and it clearly involves some of the issues cited which deal with role, organization and structural questions. Nonetheless, it does not seem to be an insurmountable problem to develop reasonably valid estimates which reflect the current inventory of public library facilities and programs and the costs required for augmentation, expansion and upgrading to some level of service which has general acceptability. A measure of the gap between existing and goal oriented service levels should provide better information about the differential need for funding among states and jurisdictions within states. This kind of hard information and data is required to formulate viable fiscal support policies, including a more rational determination of the percentage of funding to be underwritten by the three levels of government. The oft cited statement that the support of public libraries is "fiscally insignificant" is neither a precise nor persuasive argument in the increasing competitive battle for the public buck. New systematic research efforts to develop total cost estimates may validate that argument.

Notwithstanding the need for additional basic research on costs, there are other factors to be considered in resolving the issue on funding source and cost distribution.

(a) *Federal level.* It is obvious that the amount and extent of federal funding has been small and has far from realized the expectations of the LSCA designers. The impact of revenue sharing could be extremely severe on the future development of public library services because it (1) cuts off further federal funding, (2) provides the states an opportunity to reduce or eliminate their matching fund contribution and, (3) leaves local public libraries with the need to face local political and fiscal decision-makers with increased budget requests due to Federal and state cut-backs. The problem will be especially severe in urban areas because of the mismatch of needs and resources, and with respect to regional library networks which operate on a state-provided fiscal base. Preliminary data indicating actual and proposed distribution of revenue sharing funds does not provide much hope that public libraries will receive priority consideration in applying for these funds.

Beyond the political dimensions of the current revenue-sharing versus categorical grant battle there is broad justification for continuation of substantial Federal funding. Public libraries do represent an activity and service, the benefits of which, in the terminology of modern public goods theory, extend beyond the individual and his local community. Moreover, for the reasons cited earlier, funding in support of public library services is a relatively late entry into the state and Federal financing scene. Substantial and direct Federal financing is particularly appropriate to assist in the up-grading of this service to a desired level. The continuing importance of public libraries as an information resource and a civilizing force in an imperfect modern society is ample evidence of need for continued Federal involvement and support.

(b) *State level.* Considerations affecting state level involvement in funding public libraries are obvious. Clearly, in terms of public finance theory and practice, the state has basic responsibility for the development of public libraries which meet the needs of all its citizens. The state has the fiscal resources to implement this responsibility. However, a reading of the data in the public library field describing the state pattern of development, the level of state fiscal support makes it abundantly clear that the vast majority of states have not adequately met this responsibility. Nor has the LSCA achieved great success in triggering more than a modest flow of additional state dollars.

In determining an appropriate level of public library funding from state sources, consideration should be given to developments in public education financing. In that field, a recommended course of action made by a number of prestigious study groups, including the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and the President's Commission on School Finance, call for full state funding (90 percent level) of the costs of public education. The basic factors which support these conclusions are also germane to the public library field: (1) differential need for educational services to meet the requirement of equalized opportunity, and (2) intra-jurisdictional fiscal disparities for the equitable support of public education. The *Serrano v. Priest* case carried this issue to the courts. The *Rodriguez v. Texas* decision by the U.S. Supreme Court invalidated the Constitutional, but not the social and fiscal relevance of the issue. The President's Commission recommendation is instructive.

The Commission recommends that State governments assume responsibility for financing substantially all of the non-Federal outlays for public elementary and secondary education, with local supplements permitted up to a level not to exceed 10 percent of the State allocation.

The Commission further recommends that State budgetary and allocation criteria include differentials based on educational need, such as the increased costs of educating the handicapped and disadvantaged, and on variations in educational costs within various parts of the State.

To aid the States in moving toward this objective, the Commission also recommends a general purpose Federal incentive grant that would reimburse States for part of the costs of raising the State share of total State and local educational outlays above the previous year's percentage. This would be contingent on the submission by a State of a plan for achievement of full State funding over a reasonable period of time.²²

(c) *Local Level.* The central consideration in local government source funding is the property tax. In 1970, local governments raised \$39 billion in revenue from

²² *Schools, People and Money*, The President's Commission on School Finance, Washington, 1972, pp. 36-37.

local sources: \$33 billion (85 percent) of this total was derived from property taxes, primarily the tax on real estate. Nearly half (\$17.4 billion) of all local property taxes were expended for public education, and the relative portion has probably increased since 1970.³³

The difficulties with the real property tax are many and well-known. The tax is determined on an *ad valorem* basis which means that the amount of the tax for each property owner is directly proportional to the appraised value of the land and buildings. The prime difficulty lies in determining and setting the appraised or assessment value. Most state laws or constitutions call for an assessment value on each property reflecting what a willing buyer would pay to a willing seller under open market conditions. Some states prescribe that market value shall be considered but not controlling. The difficulties increase infinitely in determining assessment values for industrial, commercial and natural resource property which, under the laws of many states, must be assessed and taxed at uniform rates of taxation.

Assessment administration is usually a function of local governments, under a varying pattern of state supervision and oversight. The function is technically difficult to administer and, not surprisingly, is most vulnerable to direct and indirect political pressure. Problems with respect to assessment administration developed in most acute form in relation to state educational financing systems. Because the total assessed valuation of real estate was used as a measure of the fiscal capacity of local jurisdictions, and because it represented a widely varying percentage of "true" or market value, states were forced to develop separate estimates of market value, and to determine the average assessment ratio in each local school district. Efforts to bolster and improve assessment administration go on apace, but practices still vary widely among jurisdictions.

There are still more difficult problems with respect to *ad valorem* property taxation. To some extent, it is inherently regressive in impact: the poor property owner pays a higher percentage of his income under this tax than the rich, and sometimes he is regressively assessed. The income-property value relationship varies also among classes (residential, agricultural, industrial, etc.) of property. Only a few states have responded to the need to provide a classified property tax permitting differential rates of taxation which would reduce the income-equity problem. In the 1973 primary election in Pennsylvania, for example, voters authorized a constitutional amendment which will provide differential assessment of agricultural land.

Difficulties related to property taxation are felt in all types of jurisdictions, but particularly in urban areas. Hence, burgeoning metropolitan area growth coupled with the flight of the white middle class, has left core cities with a restricted property tax base, high tax rate, and increasing funding requirements to meet local needs. The clamor of the so-called taxpayers' revolt focuses, perhaps mistakenly, on the property tax. Presidential response to this pressure late in 1971 resulted in a request to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to explore the use of a value-added tax as a substitute for the residential property tax used for school purposes. The investigation did not recommend such a change, but it did opt for improvements in property tax administration.

Adjustments, corrections and improvements can be made in the utilization and administration of property taxation. Most observers feel, however, that it will continue to provide the basic source of revenue of local government. State takeover of public education funding would, of course, provide much local relief. That course of action remains only a promise of the future in the vast majority of states.

These are the factors to be considered in appraising the continuation of local funding of public libraries at the present high level. They provide heavy evidence that a substantial shift is required if we hope to sustain a viable pattern of public library services.

4. *More responsive, strategically designed methods of financing public library services, featuring tighter accountability and performance improvement requirements, should be explored.*

Governmental financing mechanisms reflecting enunciated goals in any functional area should be strategically designed to achieve those objectives. This means that efforts must be made to identify goals and objectives in specific terms, and to fashion a subvention system related thereto. Fiscal accountability and the possibility of sustained support for the program is thus maximized. Inter-

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

governmental financing systems—where support funds come from more than one level of government—should be integrated or sufficiently coordinated so that the combining of funds enhances the impact of each component. We are talking here about direct support governmental funding systems, not revenue sharing or tax redistribution measures. The objective of direct support aid systems is to insure the provision of specific services, at stated levels of performance, in accordance with identified, differential patterns of need, and reflecting differential abilities of subordinate governmental units to provide complementing fiscal support. The objective of tax redistribution mechanisms is to do just that—to redistribute equitably revenues collected by a higher level of government in accordance with generalized measures of fiscal need, and/or measures reflecting the relative amount of tax revenues paid by residents of subordinate jurisdictions. The point is that these objectives are different, requiring quite different bases and methods of fund distribution. The first is a function or service oriented fiscal aid system; the second has a purely fiscal orientation. Fiscal aid systems which combine these separate objectives tend to thwart or dilute the achievement of either. Nevertheless, legislative development of fiscal aid formulas provides wide opportunities for bargaining, the result of which produces "pot-sweeteners" and a variety of adjustment factors which may blur objectives.

Federal aid to public library systems has existed in organized form since the 1956 Library Services Act. Some state-aid systems for libraries existed before that time; in addition several states established or revised their aid systems as a result of LSA and the LSCA. The history of local aid to library systems is much longer. Each of these types of aid systems should be reexamined to determine their efficiency and validity in the light of restated objectives and current library development and need patterns.

(a) *Library Services and Construction Act.* The fiscal support provisions of this act have proven to be an effective, perhaps crucially important, stimulus in the development of public library services. The possibility of making substantial improvement in the mechanism should be explored, however.

The three separate titles of the act relating to (1) services, (2) construction and (3) development of library networks represent an effort to allocate and target the funds toward specific purposes. The 1970 amendments called for strengthening state library agencies, a special emphasis on services to the disadvantaged, and an effort to use metropolitan libraries as resource centers. It was hoped that additional funds could be provided to support the statement of new emphases, but that hope was not realized. This effort is noteworthy because it represented an attempt to include a differential need for library services, not otherwise reflected in the act. The strategic administrative implications of developing network arrangements (Title III) has already been discussed and should be evaluated in the light of the special funding of this activity. The legislative and administrative bases for the allocation of funds among the different titles is not known and should be further researched as part of an overall planning effort. By far the largest amount was used for Title I expenditures covering, in general, the following items:

- (1) The administration of the Federal program;
- (2) Grants-in-aid to local public libraries;
- (3) Statewide library programs, such as bookmobile service, consultancy service, workshops, etc.;
- (4) Strengthening State library agencies;
- (5) Special projects, such as service to the economically disadvantaged and physically handicapped;
- (6) Training and fellowships;
- (7) Centralized processing of books and other materials;
- (8) Other services.

Surprisingly, only about 13 percent of the total LSCA funds in 1971 and 1972 was expended for grant-in-aid programs in support of local public libraries. In view of the status of their development and the difficult financial conditions of most local governments, this modest allocation should be evaluated. In 1971, nearly half of all LSCA funds were expended for multi-unit project services, and half of that amount (28.5 percent) was used in support of statewide program development. The need to upgrade statewide agencies and their programs has been supported in the literature. The emphasis on national priority projects resulting from the 1970 amendments caused a pronounced increase in these expenditures, mainly in response to state requested augmentation of services for the handicapped and disadvantaged and similar programs. In the absence of additional Federal funds for these purposes, the data show a

shift of funding from multi-unit project services to the newly defined priorities.

As a fiscal subsidy method, the LSCA provisions represent a rather crude mechanism utilizing factors more appropriate in a tax redistribution scheme than a goal oriented aid system. The total cost of the "floor" (\$200,000—Title I, \$100,000—Title II, and \$40,000—Title III), representing the minimum grant to each state, could equal \$17 million, or nearly 30 percent of the 1972 total appropriation of \$58.6 million. That seems to be an expensive underwriting of the status-quo in a functional area where directed expansion and development are needed. Undoubtedly, some needed development was provided, but it is difficult to achieve planned objectives under this kind of arrangement. Population ratios used in fund allocation and per capita income ratios used in determining state matching requirements are also crude measures, without much if any relationship to the differential need for public library services and the differential ability to provide such services.

The LSCA also makes heavy use of the plan device in the administration and utilization of federal funds. This is a valid technique, but difficult to use because it requires intensive staff evaluation, including revision, of submitted plans, and a real ability to reduce or cut off funds if the state plan or its implementation does meet standards. It is doubtful that any state funding under LSCA was reduced or eliminated through enforcement of the plan requirement.

Another area to be considered relative to federal funding is the need to consolidate or better coordinate the many separate federal funding programs and mechanisms impacting on public libraries. The ideal solution is to consolidate such funding activity under one agency and program. A second way is to place consolidating and coordinating responsibility and authority in the agency principally responsible for public library development.

(b) *State Public Library Support Programs.* As previously indicated, a total of 35 states authorize some form of state aid to public libraries. As of 1970-71, however, only 23 states made appropriations for this purpose. The total amount appropriated was \$52.5 million. The interesting point is that of this total, 9 states appropriated \$45 million, or 82 percent of the total for all states. Moreover, New York State alone appropriated \$15.5 million, or about one-third the total for the 9 states. This indicates, of course, that in the majority of states the aid system for local public libraries operates at a nominal level.

This fact is substantiated by a recent USOE analysis of the effect of phasing out LSCA funding. Of 17 "high income" states, 4 had either no state subsidy program or one that represented an appropriation of less than \$200,000. Of 23 "low income" states, 18 were in this zero or nominal aid category. The distinction between high and low income states was based on whether the states were required to match federal funds at above or below the 50 percent standard level.²⁴ Incidentally, it can be deduced from this analysis that neither high nor low income states will fare well in the amount of funds available under LSCA compared to preliminary allocations of local revenue sharing funds. This confirms an earlier point made.

The PAS study on patterns among the states for supporting public libraries makes clear that there are three primary types of systems for disbursing state aid. Four states, California, Illinois, Michigan, and New York, use the plan device and require local libraries to submit plans stipulating reorganization of the library system as a "separate legal entity," providing wide access, designation of a headquarters library, and providing "adequate" local tax support. A second model is used by Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and New Jersey. This approach uses elements of the total system notion and establishes several strata of libraries with regional or district level responsibilities. Such libraries may receive separate state funding. A third method, described as the Maryland approach, is a modified matching system in which the state provides a fluctuating percentage of local library revenues.

The general standards and criteria suggested earlier against which financing methods can be examined are equally appropriate with respect to state subsidy methods. Further emphasis should be given at the state level to subsidy factors and criteria which provide and implement discriminating measures reflecting differential library service needs, as well as differential ability to support such services. Adjustments to take cognizance of municipal overburden factors are of special importance. None of the plans examined in broad outline form seem to fully or adequately reflect these factors. ALA's *Standards for Library Functions*

²⁴ *The Effect of the Phasing Out of The Library Services and Construction Act on High and Low Income States—Summary Analysis*, USOE, 1973 (unpublished), Tab C.

at the State Level contain good general criteria for the evaluation of current state subsidy systems.

The general finding of the St. Angelo study is confirmed by this analysis:

Continuing review should be made of grants-in-aid programs and their relationships to local appropriations for local services. Legislation may be needed either to correct inequities or to provide a better sharing of responsibilities. Special reference to metropolitan areas and services to low-income minority groups should also be reviewed.³⁰

(c) *Local Support Systems.* It is clear that the primary determinant of local public library support systems is the availability of local tax revenues, principally real estate tax proceeds. In the main, local public libraries can expect only the right to compete with other demands for a share of the local government operating and capital budgets. Special taxes and sequestered funds, earmarked for library services, are subject to their own risks and limitations. Moreover, they represent poor public finance policy in most instances. Local tax rate limitations, built into so many state library statutes, were probably designed to guarantee at least minimum funds. In some cases they now may well represent maximums, and could inhibit the continued development of needed library services. In any event, sound public finance policy would support their elimination.

Regional taxing and fiscal support schemes, often discussed as a desirable way to correct the mismatch of needs and resources at the local level, offer little immediate hope of substantially altering existing fiscal imbalances among local governments. Even the much discussed Twin Cities "share the growth plan," developed under the aegis of the St. Paul-Minneapolis council of government organization, represents only a primitive beginning towards the solution of a most serious metropolitan area problem. The ideas are noble; the political and practical obstructions to progress remain.

So, an important part of public library funding is likely to remain at the local level, subject to all the vagaries and problems current in the local government finance picture. It is hoped that substantial shifts in the burden of funding can be made to achieve a better balance. It is also hoped that the mechanisms of financing, at all levels of government, can be made more responsive and discriminating. Such developments are appropriate in terms of the fiscal and functional dimensions of providing the full range of public library services to meet the present and future needs of modern society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Information Bulletin* No. 73-4, Washington, D.C., April 1973.
- American Library Association (Standards Revision Committee, American Association of State Libraries, ALA), *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level* (revision of the 1963 edition), Chicago: American Library Association, 1970.
- Bebout, John E., "Partnership Federalism," *The Metropolitan Library*, Ralph W. Conant and Kathleen Molz (eds.), Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1972.
- Bell, David, "The Measurement of Knowledge and Technology," *Indicators of Social Change*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.
- Basingame, Ralph and DeProspero, Ernest R., Jr., "Effectiveness in Cooperation and Consolidation in Public Libraries," *Advances in Librarianship*, Vol. 1, Melvin J. Voight (ed.), New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Childers, Thomas, "Community and Library: Some Possible Futures," *Library Journal*, Vol. 96, No. 16 (Sept. 15, 1971).
- Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, *Population and the American Future*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Ecker-Racz, L. L., National Conference on State Suspension of Local Government Fiscal Performance, Philadelphia, October 1972.
- Knight, Douglas M. and Nourse, E. Shepley (eds.), *Libraries at Large*, New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1969.
- Leach, Richard H., "A Broad Look at the Federal Government and Libraries," *Libraries at Large*, Douglas M. Knight and E. Shepley Nourse (eds.), New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1969.
- Molz, Kathleen, *The Federal Role in Support of Public Libraries*, Issue Paper, U.S. Office of Education, (unpublished draft), February 18, 1972.

³⁰ St. Angelo, Hartsfield, Goldstein, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

- National Center for Educational Statistics, *Statistics of Public Libraries Serving at Least 25,000 Inhabitants—1968*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Nelson Associates, Inc., *Public Libraries in the United States: Trends, Problems, and Recommendations*, Report prepared for the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, New York: Nelson Associates, 1967.
- Orlans, Harold, "Observations and Government Library Organization and Policy," *Libraries at Large*, Douglas M. Knight and E. Shepley Nourse (eds.), New York: R.R. Bowker Company, 1969.
- Prentiss, S. Gilbert, "The State Overview: The State as a Collector of Library Statistics," *A National Plan for Library Statistics: Guidelines for Implementation*, David C. Palmer (ed.), Chicago: Statistics Coordinating Committee of the American Library Association, 1970.
- Public Administration Service, *An Inquiry Into the Patterns Among States for Funding Public Library Services*, Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1973.
- Public Administration Service, *Patterns Among the States for Supporting Public Library Services*, Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1972.
- Shera, Jesse H., "The Public Library in Perspective," *The Metropolitan Library*, Ralph W. Conant and Kathleen Molz (eds.), Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1972.
- State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, Public Law 92-512, Section 103, St. Angelo, Douglas, Hartsfield, Annie M., and Goldstein, Harold, *State Library Policy: Its Legislative and Environmental Contexts*, Chicago: American Library Association, 1971.
- Tauber, Conrad, "Population: Trends and Characteristics," *Indicators of Social Change*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.
- The Budget of the United States, 1974, Appendix.
- The President's Commission on School Finance, *Schools, People and Money*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.
- The Wall Street Journal, February 27, 1973.
- United States Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States: 1876 Report*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1876.
- United States Bureau of the Census, *Pocket Data Book, USA*, 1971.
- United States Office of Education, *The Effect of the Phasing Out of the Library Services and Construction Act on High and Low Income States—Summary Analysis*, Tab C. (unpublished), 1973.

Dr. LOWRIE. In spite of the apparent growth of this prestigious educational institution, libraries still do not have the visibility needed to truly effect a viable service for all.

A White House conference could help do this by focusing on the full spectrum of services currently available as well as those potentially available through the use of technology.

The concept of a conference which would be planned by the National Commission, representatives from the Congress, the library profession, and lay people would place before the people of this country a forum in which three basic questions could be explored as debated:

- (a) The role which library users see as the *raison d'être* of libraries.
- (b) The interrelationship among the whole range of social agencies in meeting the total needs of citizens, with the library as one of the significant supporting agencies.
- (c) The opportunity for librarians in all types of libraries—national, metropolitan, rural, school, public, academic, special—to analyze the services being given now; to explore the possibilities which could be achieved by fully implementing the national library policy; to anticipate the future regarding user needs, and the various formats, media, and techniques which might be employed for quality library and information services.

I would particularly like to emphasize the need for exploring regional developments, that is, the development of library systems which would cross political boundaries as well as types of libraries and provide far richer opportunity for sharing library materials both print and nonprint, among many.

In my own State of Michigan we are moving in the direction of creating larger units of service. There are large county and metropolitan systems such as Detroit or Wayne County which could provide more effective programs with better financial support from State and Federal funds.

They could not only service their own clientele better, but they would join with the State and university libraries to share the wealth of their resources throughout the State.

A greater use of technical communication aids already in existence should be supported, as well as experimentation with new forms.

A specific example of interlibrary sharing which particularly interests me as a member of the Michigan Governor's Commission on Higher Education is the State's southwestern educational library project: a program of regional research library services.

This is designed for public, college, and special libraries in southwestern Michigan, a group of 16 counties.

The intent is to provide library materials and services of a kind not available elsewhere in the region, to strengthen rather than replace existing programs by providing rapid access to research collections, audiovisual materials, and specialized information services normally only provided to members of the university community.

I have attached for the record a brochure describing this program.
[Brochure referred to follows:]

SOUTHWESTERN EDUCATIONAL LIBRARY PROJECT

A PROGRAM OF REGIONAL RESEARCH LIBRARY SERVICES

(Western Michigan University Libraries, Kalamazoo, Mich.)

What.—A program of regional research library service for public, college, and special libraries in Southwestern Michigan.

Where.—All services are provided by Western Michigan University Libraries.

How.—Call our Interlibrary Loan Center collect at (616) 383-6054, between the hours of noon and five, Monday through Friday. Or call by collect teletype at 810-277-2505.

When.—All services are now available, and are currently budgeted to run through June, 1971.

So you will understand fully the services available to your library, please read carefully the program description in this brochure.

I. Purpose of the project

The purpose of this experimental project is to implement the role of Western Michigan University Libraries as a Regional Resource Center, serving the research needs of many smaller institutions and individual citizens in Southwestern Michigan. The specific intent is to provide library materials and services of a kind that are not available elsewhere in the region. No duplication of the proper role of any other library is intended. The project aims to strengthen rather than to replace existing library programs, by providing rapid access to research collections, audiovisual materials, and specialized information services normally provided only to members of the University community. By sharing costly and relatively little used research materials with all citizens of Southwestern Michigan, the University Libraries hope to maximize benefits from the tax moneys devoted to purchase of these expensive research materials.

Libraries to be served are public, college, and special libraries in the following counties:

Allegan	Calhoun	Kalamazoo	Oceana
Barry	Cass	Kent	Ottawa
Berrien	Eaton	Muskegon	St. Joseph
Branch	Ionia	Newaygo	Van Buren

The project has been budgeted to run through June 30, 1971, at which time results will be evaluated. If the experiment proves successful, special funding will be sought to make the project's services available on a continuing basis.

II. Who may utilize project services

Any public, college, or special library in the sixteen-county region may obtain any of the services on behalf of any of its patrons. Any patron expressing need for the type of service offered will be eligible to receive it, provided only that he is a qualified borrower of the library transmitting the request. There is no requirement that the patron be a graduate student, professor, or member of a corporate research organization. If he is qualified to borrow from your library his statement of need for the service we are providing will suffice.

III. Services to be provided

A. Two-week loan of research monographs from the Libraries' circulating collection. (Popular fiction, best sellers, reference books, reserve collection items, etc., are not available for loan.) Renewals of loans *cannot* be authorized.

B. Free photocopies of research journal articles in the Libraries' collections. Photocopies of articles in popular journals (*Life*, *Time*, etc.) may be obtained from the State Library.

C. Free photocopies of specific reference text and newspaper articles.

D. Photocopies of card catalog subject entries under very specific LC headings.

E. Identification (as possible) of locations of items not held by WMU Libraries.

F. Ready-reference service not involving extensive research activity.

G. Delivery of audiovisual materials from the WMU Audiovisual Center and the Educational Resources Center. Rental fees charged by the Centers must be borne by the borrower. Items that can be rented are 16 mm motion pictures, filmstrips, and sound filmstrips; rental fees are indicated in the catalogs. Audio tapes are not rented or loaned because of the danger of accidental erasure of the program. However, you may send a tape to the Audiovisual Center and have a duplicate made for fifty cents per thirty minutes of program. You may also purchase a tape from the Audiovisual Center if it has the desired program. A 1200 foot tape of an audio program (on a seven inch reel) is sold for \$3.00. All programs are recorded with dual tracks (mono) and a speed of either 3¾ ips or 7½ ips. (Rental equipment—projectors, tape recorders, etc.—cannot be delivered.)

H. Delivery of circulating materials from the University Archives and Regional History Collection.

IV. Facilities for providing services

A. All requests for services should be made to the Interlibrary Loan Center, Waldo Library, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

B. Loan and photocopy requests *may* be submitted on ALA forms; however,

C. For *rapid* service, requests should be made by collect telephone or teletype to the Interlibrary Loan Center, between noon and five o'clock Monday through Friday. The telephone number is 616-383-6054. (Please do not call any other library number, as that will cause billing errors and possible confusion in handling your request.) The TWX number is 810-277-2505. Accurate and complete bibliographical descriptions should be given for each item requested.

D. Ready-reference service requests should be made by collect telephone calls, exactly as outlined in the preceding paragraph.

E. Delivery of loan items will be made by United Parcel Service, to ensure early arrival.

F. Return of loan items should be made by U.S. mail, *Educational Material Rate*, using the mailing label sent with the item. All loan items should be returned to the Interlibrary Loan Center.

G. Return of audiovisual rental items should be made by U.S. Mail, *Educational Material Rate*, using the mailing label sent with the item. Returns should be made directly to the Audiovisual Center.

H. At your request, photocopies will be sent by first-class mail directly to your patron's home address. Otherwise, they will be sent directly to your library either

by first-class mail or United Parcel Service. Photocopies will become the property of the patron, and should *not* be returned to the Interlibrary Loan Center.

I. When an item cannot be delivered promptly, or is not available for loan or rental, you will be notified by telephone.

V. Responsibility for proper return of borrowed materials

Since a loan (or rental) transaction takes place between the borrowing library and the University Libraries, the borrowing library will be responsible for the safe and *timely* return of all borrowed (or rented) materials. The University Libraries cannot deal directly with the patrons of other libraries, except in the instance of mailing free photocopies of periodical articles, etc., directly to their homes.

VI. General description of WMU collections

A. During the past five years the collections have more than doubled in size, and now contain more than 600,000 cataloged items. Additions are being made at the rate of about 100,000 items per year. Areas of greatest strength are (1) scholarly and scientific monographs published in the last five years and (2) scholarly and scientific journals published in the last five years—of which we presently subscribe to approximately five thousand.

B. The Libraries own many major series in microform. A list of these series will be distributed, and, in most cases, photocopies of specific items can be delivered.

C. Audiovisual materials are described in the printed catalogs of the Audiovisual Center and the Educational Resources Center. Copies of the catalogs will be distributed.

D. A microfilm list of the Libraries' journal holdings will be provided to libraries that desire a copy.

Dr. LOWRIE. Regionalization, system development, which would receive a real impact from White House Conference discussions, would create new patterns of library organization and would determine better methods for locating and distributing information.

Library services can no longer be implemented in isolation. They must be planned at State and national levels to avoid duplication, build on strengths in existence now, and experiment with new patterns.

The proposed series of State conferences will lead to the preparation of papers in specific areas of study which will be of assistance to the White House Conference Planning Committee.

I am aware of the costs of such a conference and of some of the objections being raised in regard to this effort. Any way in which we can move beyond the limitations of librarians talking only to themselves, even though the various professional associations do try to relate to each other regularly, would be a great step forward.

It is important that librarians from many programs have the opportunity to converse with nonlibrarians and with experts in other fields who could bring knowledge which would assist in the continuing education of the profession.

No profession can exist merely by communicating within its own boundaries.

The expanding knowledge in such fields as geriatrics, urban development, energy crisis, and environmental needs, are all a part of today's library services.

The librarians must become more knowledgeable. There are issues which must be examined jointly if libraries are going to continue to contribute to the betterment of our country and its people. The cost of such a conference would be minimal compared to the benefits received by the citizens.

The coalescing of all the forces at the command of the planning committee will help promote the concept of the library as a function

not a place, and the librarian as a professional who can listen and assist, who can inform and advocate, who can efficiently analyze user needs.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I submit that libraries are at the threshold of a new dynamic model of service.

A White House conference could be the impetus needed to impel them into a new century of service. It would be an appropriate act for the national bicentennial; it would be placing libraries in their proper position in the intellectual spectrum and force an analysis of their potential as a basic tool in the national efforts to solve the great cultural, scientific, educational problems of the times.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to testify in behalf of the joint resolutions for a White House conference in 1976.

The American Library Association urges the passage of this bill and pledges its support and cooperation in its implementation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADENAS. Thank you for a most helpful statement. I want to express my own appreciation to the American Library Association for the support you and your staff have given to this subcommittee on this and other matters before us.

Miss Lowrie, let me begin by putting a question to you.

Mr. Carlucci, in a letter to the chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, as printed in the Senate report on a companion bill said, "We think that a White House conference solely on the subject of libraries and information science would be too narrowly focused in terms of the prestige of such a conference and in terms of the considerable public expenditures necessary for such a conference.

"This is not to diminish the importance of library and information science, but does indicate, we believe, that these subjects should be examined as a part of the broader issue of education."

Would you care to comment on Mr. Carlucci's statement?

Dr. LOWRIE. I think libraries are a part of all of the educational institutions in the United States or within our country.

I don't see that we can have a library conference where librarians are just talking to librarians. It seems to me this would provide a tremendous forum for bringing in people from other agencies, other educational institutions.

We are prone to talk to ourselves, I am afraid, and we need an opportunity like this to really explore what libraries can do as service agencies in our communities.

Mr. BRADENAS. Would you want to comment, Dr. Burkhardt, on Mr. Carlucci's observation?

Dr. BURKHARDT. Yes.

I must say I think of this conference as not narrowly focused at all. I think of it as a very broad gaged affair because it deals with our knowledge resources and what to do with them for the future of this country.

I don't see anything narrow about it. I think the library and information problem affects every aspect of our lives, and the problems are going to have a good deal of discussion in this conference. The conference will be about the quality of American life and how knowledge furnished by libraries and information services can be used to enhance it.

So, I must confess I see nothing narrow about this conference at all. I think it is a very wide, humanistic conference.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Burkhardt, let me put another question to you with respect to a sentence from Mr. Carlucci's letter to the Senate Labor Committee where he said, "The activity described in House Joint Resolution 734 would duplicate the responsibilities of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences."

Would you comment on that statement?

Dr. BURKHARDT. As I said in my written testimony, Mr. Chairman, I think the conference will help the Commission enormously in working out its responsibilities and in fulfilling them.

As you know, the Commission consists of 15 people and a staff of five, two of whom are professionals. That is a very small number of people to fulfill the responsibilities with which they have been charged.

A White House conference will in effect, produce a tremendous number of assistants as well as ideas, getting things clear, and it would help our work in devising a national program. As far as I can see, it is not a duplication at all. It is an enormous strengthening and we will be carrying on, hopefully, in our work long beyond the conference and using the results to the benefit of the country. I see nothing competitive in the picture.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Dr. Burkhardt, I believe you stated you do not represent the views of the administration.

Dr. BURKHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I understand the Office of Management and Budget has requested that you so state; is that correct?

Dr. BURKHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. BRADEMAs. For the record, I would like to state that as myself a principal sponsor in the House of Representatives of the law establishing the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science that I am not unfamiliar with that statute, and that I am aware of what the House report on the bill establishing the Commission says.

I would here quote from page three of that report:

"To assure the Commission's total independence, it is made a separate agency within the executive branch, free of any control by any other Federal executive agency."

The Congress did not exclude the Office of Management and Budget from that directive. I make that observation for the edification for the personnel at OMB.

Dr. BURKHARDT, would you give us some idea of what the costs of a White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services would be?

Dr. BURKHARDT. I would like to turn this question over to Mr. Manolatos who has worked out the finances but a good deal depends on the initial philosophy of the amount of Federal guidance and organization and financial support needed to produce the various stages.

In our opinion, a considerable amount of money is needed to see to it that the delegates get to these meetings on the State and regional levels, and when you cost it out that way, it comes, I believe, to something like \$12.4 million, which is about what the White House Conference on the Aged cost, making some allowances for inflation.

Mr. Manolatos, would you like to add to that statement?

Mr. MANOLATOS. Yes, sir, it would be about \$12.4 million. This would be based on the assumption, as we stated before, that we would have participation at the state level by assisting the States in holding these meetings.

There would be a planning stage, then a stage in which we would sponsor the regional and State conferences and the national conference, and then followup costs including printing of the final report.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Dr. Burkhardt, you have been good enough to give us a very carefully and prepared agenda for the planning of the proposed conference.

I wonder, Miss Lowrie, if you could tell us if, in your judgment, that proposed agenda overall makes sense to you or if you have any significant amendments or changes that you would recommend.

Dr. LOWRIE. I have not had an opportunity to read this, but just quickly glancing at this it sounds as though it made a great deal of sense.

I particularly like the idea of the State and territorial conferences. These are significant ways in which we can get together to do pre-planning, certainly background papers, discussion of the specific needs of a State must be brought in before you can have a national conference here.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Perhaps, Miss Lowrie, what you may care to do, your not having had an earlier opportunity to review Dr. Burkhardt's statement in view of the responsibility that the resolution assigns to the National Commission for conducting the conference, perhaps you would like to give the subcommittee a prepared statement commenting on his paper.

Dr. LOWRIE. This would be most helpful for commenting on some of the things we have in mind.

We would certainly wish to work very closely with the Commission on this.

[Supplementary statement referred to follows:]

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY JEAN E. LOWRIE, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

The six areas of concern outlined by Dr. Burkhardt in his prepared statement—the needs of users, the deficiencies in current services, the trend toward cooperative action, the financial base for libraries, the potential of new technology, and the staffing and manpower needs of libraries and information centers—are areas of major importance to library service, and the American Library Association is in complete agreement with the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science that these areas should be included as agenda items for both state conferences and the 1976 White House Conference. A number of good suggestions have been put forward by others as well which we believe should also be included, such as standardization in library automation, preservation of library materials, intellectual freedom, bibliographic coordination of state and local government publications, or the special needs of urban libraries, to name only a few. For maximum effectiveness of the proposed conferences, agenda items must be determined by a wide range of individuals at the local, state, and national levels, for the success of these conferences will depend upon their responsiveness to the needs of all library users and potential users.

In addition to the many good suggestions that have been offered already to this subcommittee, I would suggest that a Library and Information Service Fair be held in conjunction with the 1976 White House Conference. To demonstrate available service as well as futuristic possibilities, a stimulating exhibition of innovative resources and equipment—books, print and nonprint audiovisual materials, films, tape cassettes, TV, cable and satellite transmissions and video recordings—should be planned combining the expertise and experience of publishers,

producers and performers. The public at large should be invited to participate, experimenting with dial access, dataphone transmissions from local libraries and computer applications. Perhaps the staff of Today show would consider doing their daily news and general information program from the fair site in Washington, D.C. during the week of the White House Conference. Sesame Street and Electric Company could be telecast with live performers and puppeteers available for personal appearances and question and answer sessions.

Other agenda items for the national conference or for the preceding conferences in the states and territories, might include but should certainly not be limited to the following:

STATISTICAL AND ECONOMIC DATA

Both the state conferences and the White House Conference should have before them as an important agenda item the kinds of statistical and economic data which are needed for planning effective systems of library service and for measuring library performance. Renewed interest is being shown in this subject, both within the library community and by professionals in other disciplines such as economics and statistics.

Two recent examples of published books in this field are: *Economics of Academic Libraries* by William J. Baumol and Maritzyahu Marcus, Princeton University (American Council on Education, 1973) and *Library Funding and Public Support* by Robert W. Frase, Consulting Economist (American Library Association, 1973). The United States Office of Education is also now planning to institute a new cooperative federal-state system of collecting national and state library statistics to take the place of the former system of national library surveys conducted solely by the federal government. Part of this planning for the new federal-state system consists of an American Library Association project for a new *Library Statistics Handbook* to replace the 1966 publication, *Library Statistics: A Handbook of Concepts, Definitions, and Terminology*.

Discussion of needed statistical and economic data in the state conferences and in the national conference should be based on carefully prepared background materials commissioned by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science well in advance of the state conferences.

SYSTEMS OF LIBRARY FINANCING

Existing patterns of financial support for libraries are many and varied. The extent to which they are adequate must be examined in depth, not only for public libraries but for academic, school, special, state and federal libraries as well. Where inadequate, new approaches must be developed and implemented so that optimum provision of library and information service is assured for all the people of the United States through cooperation of the federal government with state and local governments and public and private agencies. *Basic Issues in the Governmental Financing of Public Library Services* by Rodney P. Lane (commissioned by the U.S. Office of Education, 1973) is a recent example of the kind of library finance study, more of which are needed for all types of libraries so that intelligent decisions can be made to place the provision of library service on a sound financial base.

INVENTORY OF LIBRARY NEEDS

An inventory must be taken, at the local, state, and national levels (and possibly at the interstate regional level as well) of library needs, to assess progress made and necessary future development. This would update the comprehensive *National Inventory of Library Needs* (American Library Association, 1966; reprinted in *Hearings on the Library Services and Construction Act amendments, HR 14050*, before the House Select Subcommittee on Education, 1966). Some of the topics covered in the earlier inventory which must be updated include: needs of school libraries, the public library service gap, inventory of academic library resources and services, inventory of library resources in correctional institutions, library education, and standards and statistics.

POPULATION ANALYSES

In preparation for the conferences, population analyses must be studied, and if necessary conducted, at local, state, and national levels so that libraries know fully the makeup of the population they must serve. Persons not accustomed to using the library and persons with specialized library and information needs

must be identified and their concerns articulated. For example, the attached table shows the nation's American Indian population by state. Similar kinds of population data for other groups within our national population, particularly those who may now be taking full advantage of libraries, must be studied as a basis for development of library service designed to reach all Americans. (see attachment)

SPECIAL CONCERNS

The conferences should plan sessions on special concerns to consider the needs of special groups, such as the blind and physically handicapped, the homebound, the aging, the hospitalized, prisoners, the bilingual, those unable to read, and all minority groups within our population whose library and information needs may differ from those of the majority. The National Survey of Library Services to the Aging (Cleveland Public Library, 1971) is a recent example of the kind of analysis of library needs of a special population that is necessary for effective extension of library and information service to currently unserved or inadequately served groups.

LIBRARY EDUCATION AND MANPOWER NEEDS

The quality of the nation's library and information services is necessarily dependent upon the quality of the manpower staffing our nation's libraries and information centers. Library manpower needs must be determined and training programs instituted as well as re-training programs for both professionals and paraprofessionals. The Study of Library and Information Science Manpower, Supply and Demand, now being prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the Office of Education, will provide useful data on which to plan and develop training to meet national library and information needs. Publication of this study is expected in 1974.

FEDERAL LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

The resources of our approximately 2,000 federal library and information centers constitute a wealth of material with enormous potential for service and research. The federal library community consists not only of the three major national libraries—Library of Congress, National Library of Medicine, and National Agricultural Library—but also the Presidential Libraries, libraries serving Cabinet departments and indeed practically every government agency, libraries serving the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, federal academic libraries, school libraries, special technical libraries, institutional libraries, and general libraries. The Federal Library Committee coordinates activity among the many federal libraries and serves as a bridge with nonfederal libraries, to meet not only the needs of the federal government but also those of the general public. No conference on library and information services would be complete without including as a major agenda item the resources and services, both actual and potential, of the federal library community.

THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

The importance of the depository library system cannot be over-emphasized and as the volume and complexity of government information increase, the depository libraries take on added significance not only for business and industry, for the scientist and sociologist, the scholar and the student, but for countless others who find government publications increasingly useful, even indispensable, in their diverse activities. Indeed, today there is scarcely a field untouched by government publications. The depository library system needs modernizing so that it can function effectively in making government publications available to all Americans. Careful examination of its present strengths and weaknesses is required as a basis for its future development. Improved bibliographic coordination of all government publications is essential so they are readily accessible to all who may need them. Conferences at the state and national levels should definitely place high on their agendas an examination of the depository library system as it affects all Americans and how it can be improved to better serve them.

THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF LIBRARIES AND OTHER SOCIAL AGENCIES

The conferences would provide a unique opportunity to examine, at the state and local level as well as at the national level, the interrelationship of the whole range of social agencies and how together they can best work to meet the total

needs of all Americans. Libraries as one of many significant supporting agencies must be seen in their community context and their services must be developed and extended in concert with other community services.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that the proposed conferences in the states and territories and the White House Conference itself must be responsive to the concerns of all our people. As the National Advisory Commission on Libraries stated in its 1968 report, *Library Services for the Nation's Needs*, there is "a service orientation that pervades every existing and conceivable library and information function. Perhaps it is not too soon to propose the criterion of social value as the most important in decision making—whether for broad central planning, more specific planning or immediate problem solving . . . A library can be understood only as it enhances a socially valuable function, one of which—and one that all libraries can enhance—is the personal intellectual and ethical development of every individual in our society. The variety of the other socially valuable functions determines the need for variety in kinds of libraries."

In this spirit of social awareness, the American Library Association strongly supports and urges prompt enactment of legislation calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

INDIAN POPULATION IN STATES WITH 4,000 INDIANS OR MORE¹

	Number, 1960	Percentage of all In- dians, 1970	Number, 1970
United States	551,669	100.0	2,827,651
1. Oklahoma	61,689	11.8	97,731
2. Arizona	83,387	11.6	95,812
3. California	39,014	11.0	91,018
4. New Mexico	55,255	8.8	72,798
5. Alaska	42,522	6.2	51,528
Aleuts	(5,755)		(35,252)
Eskimo	(22,323)		(16,276)
Indian	(14,444)		(16,276)
6. North Carolina	39,129	5.2	43,487
7. Washington	21,076	4.0	33,386
8. South Dakota	25,914	3.9	32,365
9. New York	16,491	3.4	29,330
10. Montana	21,181	3.3	27,130
11. Minnesota	15,496	2.8	23,128
12. Wisconsin	14,297	2.3	18,924
13. Texas	5,750	2.2	18,132
14. Michigan	9,701	2.0	16,854
15. North Dakota	11,736	1.7	14,369
16. Oregon	8,026	1.6	13,510
17. Illinois	4,704	1.4	11,413
18. Utah	6,961	1.4	11,273
19. Colorado	4,288	1.1	8,836
20. Kansas	5,069	1.1	8,672
21. Florida	2,504	.8	6,719
22. Idaho	5,231	.8	6,687
23. Ohio	1,910	.8	6,654
24. Nebraska	5,545	.8	6,624
25. Pennsylvania	2,122	.7	5,533
26. Missouri	1,723	.7	5,405
27. Louisiana	3,587	.7	5,366
28. Wyoming	4,020	.6	4,200
29. Virginia	2,155	.6	4,904
30. New Jersey	1,699	.6	4,706
31. Massachusetts	2,118	.5	4,475
32. Maryland	1,538	.5	4,258
33. Mississippi	3,119	.5	4,113

¹ U.S. census data cited in "To Live on This Earth," by Estelle Fuchs and Robert J. Havighurst, Doubleday, 1972. (Also in paper, Doubleday, 1973.)

² Includes 35,252 Aleuts and Eskimos partly estimated.

Source: U.S. census of population, 1970, 1960.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Harlan, what comment would you give us on the attitudes of young people today toward using libraries?

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say that libraries and information services are taken for granted, not only by young people but people of all ages.

I would say this taking for granted of services is something that libraries must deal with to improve their effect on the American public.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Could you tell us a little bit about the American Library Society?

Mr. HARLAN. The American Library Society was founded in 1970. It is an organization consisting of libraries and other concerned citizens who want to promote the use of libraries throughout our country.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Do you have any comment on the recent book burnings in South Dakota? Have you read about them?

Mr. HARLAN. I heard about it this morning.

Mr. BRADEMAs. One of the books burned was by an author from South Bend, Ind., so I have a particular interest in that.

Mr. HANSEN. Let me thank you also for your testimony, not only for the support that you have voiced for the proposed conference, but for your very constructive and specific suggestion on how it might be structured and how the agenda might be framed.

I would say, also, to Dr. Burkhardt that I particularly appreciate your statement because it reflects your own views which are the products of your very considerable experience in this field. This is why the Commission was created and you were appointed to that Commission.

Without that kind of frank expression of your views, it seems to me much of the value of the Commission would be lost.

So, we are grateful to you for your testimony.

I would say to Miss Lowrie that I am particularly impressed with your emphasis on the need for regional developments.

I would ask that if in addition to the opportunities that you refer to for sharing, is it not going to be necessary almost for survival to move toward regional arrangements and cooperative efforts because of the sheer growth in the volume of information and in the cost of gathering and disseminating this information to the people who can use it?

Dr. LOWRIE. I think you are absolutely right, and particularly in the view of the fact that knowledge is available to people all over by means of television and other media of communications so they are asking questions in remote areas of the country, for example, that they might not have been asking earlier.

We need to get information, knowledge, and facts to these people. The only way we can do it is by sharing through interlibrary loans, telefacsimile, or various kinds of regional programs that will support this kind of knowledge quest that we have.

Mr. HANSEN. Perhaps if we can do nothing more than impress the American public with what it does cost and that indeed we are developing the technology that makes it possible to serve more people efficiently, then the White House Conference will have served an enormous and useful purpose.

Dr. LOWRIE. I think you are right.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Lehman?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no comments, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Peyser?

Mr. PEYSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am delighted to see you went to Keuka College. This is the only claim I have been able to get from New York this morning, even though I know New York is represented here among the libraries.

Kenka is a very fine upstate New York school. My neighbor, Jean McIntosh, keeps telling me about it.

Dr. LOWRIE. I know her very well.

Mr. PEYSER. John, I want to express my real appreciation that you are here this morning. I think it is important for the record to indicate, although you may not want to emphasize it at this point, that you are 15 years old and I think in 2 days you are going to be 16, so my early congratulations to you. I think that it is great that you have this active interest, and I think this is just very important for us to have young people like yourself who are willing to do this kind of thing and get involved.

I think it is a real plus for the library system as well.

Dr. BURKHARDT. I would like to ask a question dealing with one phase of your report, and that is on page 5, the question of potential of new technology.

This is an area in which I have been very interested. I have found through visits to a number of libraries, school libraries as well as public libraries, that audiovisual material, if used correctly, can be a tremendous stimulus to learning and the use of libraries.

From what I have seen, though, I don't think they are used nearly as well in libraries as their potential would indicate they could be used.

I am wondering if in the work you do in the Commission if there is anything that has been directed to libraries on how to really utilize better this type of learning vehicle.

Dr. BURKHARDT. Mr. Peyser, in the studies we have made, there is agreement with your observation; namely, that the libraries have not used audiovisual aids to quite their full potential yet.

I think there are various reasons for this. One is lack of training, lack of education in the use and in the capacity of these new instruments.

Time will take care of this, but there is nothing really that can be done about it except to make clear the power of this new technology of various kinds and try to get it understood.

I think we are in a transitional period now. I am an optimist about it working out. The great part of the youth of this country being so accustomed to getting its information through the picture and sound media that it is bound to be one of the major avenues of getting knowledge and information. So, I would say it is largely an educational matter.

Mr. PEYSER. As an amateur on this—and I throw this out just as an idea and not a question but something you have already looked at.

One of the problems I have seen is that this kind of equipment and this kind of material is not cataloged so that it is just as accessible as a book on a certain subject matter.

I found when we made inquiries on this there was a great deal of difficulty in finding where this material was located.

So, I am just saying as a suggestion, if there is any way before the conference in 1976 even of promoting this type of thing, I think it is a real tool that is a plus for libraries.

Dr. BURKHARDT. Perhaps Miss Lowrie has something to say about this.

Dr. Lowrie. I would like to comment on it as a library educator and as president of the American Library Association.

We have a committee in the association studying and promoting how we can get greater use of hardware and software in libraries; second, I think in all of our library school programs we are definitely encouraging the use of total media as a concept in library services.

Third, I would like to point out we are having programs in continuing education, in-training service and workshops and so forth for librarians in the field in order to get them familiar, to orient them, to take away some of the fear there is of using this kind of material.

Yes; it is a problem but it is one about which we are attempting to do something. Certainly by the time of the White House Conference we should have some exciting information available to share.

Dr. BURKHARDT. In the early days, most of this automated, technological material was oversold and expectations were created that were not lived up to and the great disappointment ensued.

I think this is only now just beginning to be rectified. Now, I think there is a much better understanding of the limitations and of the power. The technology has now improved so that some of the things can be delivered today were just sales talk, 5, 8, 10 years ago.

Dr. Lowrie. May I also add an interrelationship between print and nonprint is being built into programs now so they are not two separate tracks down which we are moving.

Mr. PEYSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEN. It may be of interest to know that this subcommittee has jurisdiction over educational technology, so we do have some opportunity to have in mind your concerns and the concerns in that field and the interrelationships as we legislate.

Thank you all very much, indeed, Miss Lowrie, Dr. Burkhardt, and Mr. Harlan.

We appreciate your testimony.

We have two more panels, the Chair would say, composed of two witnesses each.

The next two witnesses are the Honorable Quincey Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, and Mr. James B. Rhoads, the Archivist of the United States.

Dr. Mumford and Mr. Rhoads, would you make your way up to the witness table?

We are very pleased to have both of you distinguished officials with us.

Dr. Mumford, Mr. Rhoads, as the Chair said earlier, if you would be kind enough to summarize your statements that will afford the members of the subcommittee more opportunity to question you.

STATEMENT OF L. QUINCY MUMFORD, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

Dr. MUMFORD. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my statement is relatively brief.

I appreciate this opportunity to appear here to speak to House Joint Resolutions 734, 766, and related resolutions to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

I think it is particularly fitting that such a conference should be held in 1976, not only because of our Nation's Bicentennial and the

American Library Association's centennial, but because this is the 20th anniversary of the First Federal Library Services Act.

With the passage of that act, which was a long time in the making, the Congress recognized the needs of its citizens in the area of library services.

Quite correctly, the first Federal resources allotted for library services went to those rural areas that had heretofore been unable to obtain such service.

Certainly one of the most poignant scenes during the late fifties and early sixties was the sight of a bookmobile well stacked with library materials and a friendly librarian dispensing free library services to citizens in remote rural areas.

As was the case in social, scientific, and technological fields, the 1960's wrought tremendous changes in library service and in library technology.

It is my own personal opinion that this period will historically be one of the most important for library service in America.

With the rapid advance of technology and the advent of the computer, many librarians gradually became information scientists.

The application of computer processes to technical library processing was a dream 15 years ago and today the Library of Congress is distributing cataloging data for English and French language books, serials, maps, and films in all languages on magnetic tape to libraries and processing centers throughout the country.

Plans are underway to extend the book program to other foreign languages. Numerous computer applications to library processes are now considered routine.

The 1960's saw major moves toward cooperative library services. The Library of Congress Public Law 480 program and the national program for acquisitions and cataloging were initiated.

Tremendous dollar savings have been effected through these programs and as a byproduct standardization among libraries has become a reality.

This standardization is necessary if we are to continue to advance in the application of computer technology.

The last decade was the period when the Library of Congress reading program for the blind was extended to the physically handicapped. In 1966 when the extension was requested, we were servicing approximately 100,000 readers. Today that figure is nearly 400,000 and it is growing every day.

It was also during this period that elementary and secondary school libraries received a tremendous boost resulting from title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In many of the buildings erected during this period, the library is the central learning center for the school.

From the number of invitations to library dedications that I have received, I am well aware of the incentive provided by the library construction provisions of the Library Services and Construction Act and the Higher Education Act.

More recently, the library profession has carried on a searching inquiry of library and information science first through the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and then through the permanent Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Today we are all aware of the tremendous competition for Federal funds. Libraries in particular have lived a see-saw existence during the last few fiscal years.

Dire consequences are being predicted by librarians should Federal funding be further curtailed or eliminated.

The point I am leading to is that librarians have in some instances been reacting to the same pressures that have been felt by other segments of our educational community and in many instances have not had the time for much serious reflection on the questions of goals and the role of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science in establishing these goals.

We must not let the basic goal of getting books into the hands of readers be impeded by the necessary emphasis on information science.

In other instances, serious reflection has not been given to an evaluation of the varied and innovative library programs aimed at the culturally and materially disadvantaged citizen.

I mention these only as examples of areas that need attention.

A White House Conference on Library and Information Services could not be better timed. A conference in Washington which would reflect all aspects of librarianship—school, public, State, academic, special, Federal, and computer technology—could have a very meritorious effect on the future of library and information services throughout the country.

I think that the Senate report stated this quite well in saying that a White House conference would not necessarily produce a blueprint or master plan but that new patterns of cooperation and coordination could be achieved through articulation of the White House conference of recommendations that will evoke the voluntary support of interested citizens and professional librarians.

The time has come, I believe, for consideration and discussion of what has been achieved in the years of phenomenal growth and of what needs to be achieved in the future.

I know that we at the Library of Congress—and I daresay the Federal library community, which is represented by the Federal Library Committee established by the Library of Congress and the then Bureau of the Budget in 1965—have several priorities that need to be discussed with the general library community.

gress and the then Bureau of the Budget in 1965—have several priorities that need to be discussed with the general library community.

One of the more pressing problems we are going to have to face is the problem of preservation of library materials—something that should be of immediate concern to librarians of all kinds of libraries.

I note that House Joint Resolution 766 authorizes the Librarian of Congress to detail personnel to the National Commission to assist them in carrying out their responsibilities for such a conference.

We will, of course, be very happy to provide the conference with key specialists on our staff whose expertise in library technology is unique.

I would, however, hope that this would be on a reimbursable service basis. In most instances, we would need to continue to carry on the functions performed by these individuals should there be a prolonged absence.

I would be happy to answer any questions the subcommittee might have.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you, Dr. Mumford.
Dr. Rhoads?

**STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES B. RHOADS, ARCHIVIST OF THE
UNITED STATES**

Dr. RHOADS. Mr. Chairman, I am most appreciative of this opportunity to appear before the Select Subcommittee on Education in its consideration of the several resolutions calling for a White House Conference in 1976 on Library and Information Services.

I am sure we all sympathize with the objectives of House Joint Resolutions 734 and 766. Access to information and ideas is indeed indispensable to the development of human potential, to the advancement of civilization, and to the continuance of enlightened self-government.

Libraries and information centers are among those institutions whose primary purpose and function is the preservation and dissemination of information, and their growth and expansion are essential if all Americans are to have reasonable access to adequate information services.

In recent years, these important institutions have received much nationwide attention.

I understand that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is submitting a report to the committee indicating the administration's position on House Joint Resolutions 734 and 766. I would, therefore, defer to the Department as to their specific provisions.

I would like to take this opportunity, however, to call to the attention of this committee an even more vital source of information to which little consideration is given.

Books and journals, reports and special studies—the entire body of published materials that are the special province of libraries and information centers—are certainly important to our people and to our Nation.

But behind the flood of publications, and all too frequently obscured by the flood are the unpublished sources, the archives and manuscripts, public and private, upon which publications directly or indirectly are based.

The value of current records and personal papers as sources of information is fully understood by this committee. But as these unpublished sources become noncurrent, as they are no longer needed to conduct day-to-day activities, it is essential that adequate provision be made for their appraisal in terms of archival value, and that those that have enduring value be properly preserved and made readily accessible.

Archives and manuscripts constitute the primary source materials on which published secondary works are based or should be based.

Thus, in a way that the resources of libraries and information centers are not, the resources of archival agencies and manuscript repositories comprise the very bedrock of the library and information science community itself.

Archives and manuscripts document the rights and interests of citizens and of government at every level. In addition to their administrative, legal, and fiscal values they contain unique information of wide research and broad educational value.

It is the longstanding and continuing neglect of these unique information resources to which I wish to call your attention.

Much has been written about the information explosion in our times, and a good deal of valuable work has been done in defining the scope and nature of the problems facing libraries and information centers.

With regard to archival and manuscript repositories, however, virtually nothing has been done.

We are lacking even the basic data needed to fully describe this problem. At present, there is only partial and largely outdated information available regarding:

1. The number and location of archival agencies in the United States, and of institutions that informally serve as archival repositories or that collect personal papers and the noncurrent records of other institutions and organizations.

2. The nature and adequacy of the physical facilities devoted to preserving archival resources, and the number and qualifications of persons involved in work with archives and manuscripts.

3. The policies and practices in accordance with which noncurrent records and personal papers are acquired by archival repositories, and the restrictions that govern access to and use of such materials.

4. The nature and adequacy of facilities and staff for providing informational services on archival materials.

5. The acquisition, preservation, and utilization of nontextual, particularly audiovisual and machine-readable records and archives.

As one measure of the relative neglect of archival resources, I cite the following data based upon a cursory survey made in the past 2 years.

In 30 of our States, the official State archival agency had a staff of less than 10 persons, including all professional, technical, secretarial, and clerical personnel.

Sixteen of the 30 had less than five persons, 6 and only two persons, and 4 official agencies each had only one staff member.

With the majority of State archival agencies thus unable to deal effectively with the serious and evergrowing records and archival problems at the State government level, it is certainly not realistic to expect these same agencies to meet the archival needs of more than 81,000 local government entities, particularly our counties and municipalities.

Fewer than a half dozen of our cities have made adequate provisions for their archives, and in most States no attention at all has been given to the noncurrent records of townships, of school districts, and of special commissions and authorities.

The records and archives of local government, so closely related to the daily lives of our citizenry past and present, continue to be one of the most neglected of our historical, cultural, and informational resources.

The situation regarding the archives of private institutions and organizations, and of family and personal papers is equally unfortunate.

Such archives and manuscripts, with some exceptions and contrary to the general European practice, have traditionally been collected, preserved, and made available in this country by private manuscript

repositories, State and local historical societies, and a scattering of research libraries.

These private agencies for some time have been unable to continue their support of archival activities out of their own resources.

Increasing costs have forced many State and local historical societies to reduce or even to discontinue their collecting and preservation programs, and several of them have found it necessary for the first time in their history to charge user fees for scholars, students, and the general public who desire to use their research resources.

Much valuable documentation of our urban society has already been lost as a result of these circumstances.

It is ironic that much more attention has been given by the Federal Government to the purchase and dissemination of published materials than to preserving and making accessible archives and manuscripts, the most basic sources of information.

Any consideration of the issues of information science should include the problems of archival agencies and manuscript repositories.

Like libraries and information centers, they, too, provide basic information and educational services.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADENAS. Thank you, Dr. Rhoads.

Let me invite each of you to comment on this question:

In his statement, Dr. Burkhardt listed what he felt should be six areas of primary concern for the proposed White House conference.

He listed the needs of users, deficiencies in the current operations, trend for cooperative action, the financial basis for libraries, the potential of library technologies, and the staffing of library and information centers.

Does the enumeration satisfy your own professional judgment as to the appropriate items to be considered on the agenda of the conference, or have you amendments or additions, Dr. Mumford?

Dr. MUMFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have not had a chance to read and study those, but I think they would certainly be among the major areas to be explored, discussed, but I think there might be a number of other library problems that need discussion.

At the request of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we submitted a number of areas where we thought it would be very fruitful to have discussion at such a conference, where there are problems that need to be resolved and, hopefully, some consensus arrived at. I think there might be other areas, but I certainly think those mentioned by Dr. Burkhardt are important ones.

Mr. BRADENAS. Dr. Rhoads?

Dr. RHOADS. I would tend to agree with Dr. Mumford's statement in general.

I think that not only in the library world but also the archival world with which I am more familiar, all of these six matters that Dr. Burkhardt called our attention to are important ones.

They have their counterpart in the archival field and they are important ones that need to be addressed.

Mr. BRADENAS. Dr. Rhoads, I have, as you know, the privilege of serving as the member for the House of Representatives on the Na-

tional Commission on Historical Publications, of which you are the chairman.

I wonder if I could put a couple of questions to you that touch in part on the work of that Commission as well as on the subject of your testimony here today in that there are very few opportunities to see the Archivist before Congress.

One has to do with what efforts are being made in the United States today to preserve archives at the local and State level.

We see an increasing sensitivity to the preservation of historical monuments. For example, yesterday I put an editorial in the Congressional Record from the La Porte Herald-Argus of Indiana, calling attention to the need for concern about that problem in communities throughout the country, but I don't recall seeing an editorial or much popular discussion with respect to the need of citizens to be sensitive to preserving what might be described as archival materials.

What might you have to say about that?

Dr. RHODES. I think you are quite right that there is not enough awareness on the part of the general public of the value of such materials and the importance of preserving them.

I think that is true with regard both to personal papers of individuals who may have made some important contribution to society and to the records of government at the local level or the records of the business community and various kinds of institutions.

I think awareness of the problem is increasing. Under the auspices of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, more particularly its heritage committee, there has been a good deal of attention given to initiatives on the part of the major historical professions and other interested groups toward establishment of a program which would focus resources both from the Federal Government and from other sources on this problem.

This was embodied in a bill calling for the establishment of a national historical records program introduced in the Senate by Senator Brooke.

I understand informally that there is consideration being given in a preliminary fashion by the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives to the same problem.

I think that the particular mechanism which may be represented by the Brooke bill on the one hand or other proposals on the other is not as important as the objective of doing something about the really appalling situation.

Mr. BRADEN. You speak of mechanisms and appalling situations in a different context, differently from that which I am now about to put a question to you on:

The National Historical Publications Commission, of course, has responsibility in connection with the publication of papers of Presidents as well as other areas of responsibilities.

What are we going to do about tapes for the future historians of the United States?

I ask that obviously provoked by recent developments, but it seems to me it is a very serious problem for the Henry Cowings and the Arthur Schlesingers of the next generation.

We are going to be trying to write the history of these times. I don't ask you for any particular programmatic observations, but can you give us any philosophical observations in particular on the way in which

the Commission and historians generally are going to cope with that problem?

I will then ask the Librarian of Congress to make any comment he wishes to make on that because his institution is supposed to be a repository of all such information as well.

Dr. RHOADS. I would prefer to answer the question this way, Mr. Chairman: That tapes, as with any other means of recording information—paper, photographs, machine-readable records, computer tapes, that sort of thing—are all sources of information and potential sources of history.

It would certainly be my hope that tapes that contain historically valuable information would be retained and eventually made available for historical research use.

Mr. BRADEMAs. That was exactly the reason earlier given by this President for his having used the mechanism of tapes at the White House, of course, for historical research.

I won't press you in this matter. I would only suggest that I think it is a profoundly serious question for at least the scholarship aside from public policy implications.

I would put this question to you: At the outset of this administration's use or in an earlier administration of which you may be aware of for that matter, did the White House make any effort to get in touch with the Office of the Archivist in connection with plans to store these tapes for historical purposes?

Dr. RHOADS. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, there was no contact with regard to tapes.

We have a concern of which the White House is certainly aware, that historically valuable papers and other research materials generated in the White House, in this administration and in previous and future administrations, will be preserved in the appropriate Presidential libraries, but the answer to your question is no.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I would hope it is a question to which scholars and others with responsibility in this matter would give attention to.

Do you have any comment, Mr. Mumford, on that general set of questions?

Dr. MUMFORD. As you know, Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of oral history projects conducted throughout the country. The Library of Congress has been presented tapes of interviews of distinguished people throughout the world.

More recently, there have been proposals for recording news broadcasts for preservation for posterity and placing them in a repository; namely, the Library of Congress.

It would require a large amount of money, and so far there has not been a hearing on this legislation.

We do have a limited collection of taped texts, but I agree with Dr. Rhoads that certainly insofar as they provide the raw materials for history, they should be preserved.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I appreciate hearing that.

I am just concerned about safeguarding friends of mine like Theodore White from subsequent incidents of embarrassment for which they have no real responsibility.

Mr. Hansen?

Mr. HANSEN. I have no questions, but I would not wish to miss the opportunity that your appearance presents to acknowledge my own

personal appreciation, and I am sure I can echo that of my colleagues in Congress for the enormously valuable service that both the Library of Congress and the Archives furnishes to the Congress and to the country.

I might note also that I was elated earlier this year when I received notice of my appointment to the Joint Committee on the Library.

With the help of the Library of Congress, I did a little research on that committee and learned among other things that it is the oldest committee in terms of continuous service in the Congress, having been started, I believe, in 1803 or thereabouts.

Then I learned from experience that it is also one of the least active committees in the Congress.

I would point out that there are subcommittees in both the House and Senate that do address themselves to matters of interest to the Library of Congress, but I would enter a plea and this is partly to my distinguished chairman, who serves with me on that joint committee, that a worthwhile endeavor, it seems to me, would be to revive that joint committee and make it the kind of effective instrument that I believe it can be to serve the Congress and the Library.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Will the gentleman yield?

I am delighted to hear Mr. Hansen make that observation because as he indicated I am a member of that subcommittee and it has not been the most aggressive committee.

May I say by way of explanation not by way of justification that most of the members of it are extremely busy on a variety of other committees and unhappily we do not seem to be able to find time to get around to it.

I think so important is the Library of Congress and so deficient that we in Congress have been in attending to our oversight responsibilities, I hope, Dr. Mumford, it will not be many months before you are hearing from Mr. Hansen and myself.

Mr. HANSEN. I would say we have to express appreciation in one way at least for an employee of the Library who brought suit against the Library and joined as codefendants, members of the Joint Committee on the Library. This was the only occasion we have had to meet so far this year, to decide what to do about that lawsuit and to express our unhappiness that we are named as codefendants.

I would hope we could meet on other occasions on more constructive items in the future.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you, Dr. Mumford and Dr. Rhoads, for your excellent statements.

Our final two witnesses today are Mr. Roger Stevens, chairman of the National Book Committee, whom we see here in a guise rather different from the one with which he is normally identified with, and also Dr. Townsend Hoopes, president, the Association of American Publishers.

We will hear first from Mr. Stevens.

Mr. STEVENS. May Mr. Jack Franz, who is the executive director of the National Book Committee join me?

Mr. BRADEMAs. Yes; of course.

Gentlemen, we are pleased to have you here.

Mr. STEVENS. You are an old friend of this subcommittee in connection with our work in the arts and humanities field where you gave such distinguished leadership for so many years.

We know, of course, of your leadership in the Kennedy Center, so we are particularly pleased to have you here today and Mr. Hoopes, we are glad to have you here. Congratulations on your new responsibility and on the publication of your new book.

I have not had a chance to look at it but I will do so as soon as I can. Dr. Hoopes, I will see that you do, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF ROGER L. STEVENS, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, NATIONAL BOOK COMMITTEE

Mr. STEVENS, Mr. Chairman, my name is Roger L. Stevens. I am chairman of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and chairman of the National Book Committee.

I appear today in support of House Joint Resolution 766 providing for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services to be held in our Bicentennial year, 1976.

First, I would like to add a personal note concerning my feelings regarding the need for libraries in this country.

Foolishly, I left the University of Michigan after only a few months, thinking as many people do at that age, that a university education would be of no use to me.

However, when I faced the world in the midst of the depression, I found there were no jobs available, especially for those untrained and inexperienced.

During the years 1931 through 1935, when I was out of a job, which was more often than not, I spent most of my time living in libraries.

Through the help of librarians, courses of study were mapped out for me, and I gradually acquired a taste for literature which has served me well all my life.

If more people were encouraged to develop this taste, unlimited enjoyment and contentment could be brought to millions of people, regardless of their financial circumstances and especially during their declining years.

With all the attention that has been paid to performing and visual arts lately, it seems to me that literature, which is the fundamental basis of all the arts, has been ignored during the last few years; and I hope your committee will keep it in mind in future legislation.

As to the National Book Committee, it is an independent nonprofit organization of citizens devoted to the literary arts. It works to recognize and reward literary merit, to promote the use of libraries, to increase the level of literacy in America, and to foster the motivation and freedom-to-read.

Our better known activities include the national library week program, the administration of the national book awards, and the presentation of the National Medal for Literature.

It seems to me that the proposed White House Conference on Libraries is well conceived, well timed, and well organized. As to its basic purpose, there is no doubt as to the necessity and importance of such a gathering.

The libraries of the Nation, at all levels of both Government and education, are the crucial component in a society built upon information and communications.

By 1976 we will be fully prepared to take a close, objective, and penetrating look at our libraries. We need to make a careful assessment of

their strengths and weaknesses, their needs and resources, and their realistic potential to serve society well in the closing years of this century.

The United States alone now produces new books at the rate of nearly 40,000 titles per year. In addition, the foreign production of books and other library materials is assuming greater importance in the daily conduct of American affairs.

An efficient, economical system of library services is absolutely essential if we are to escape chaos in communications and inundation by information.

The resolution before you correctly designates the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as the auspices for the proposed conference.

The Commission itself had its origins in the same complex of social and educational factors that make the conference so highly desirable.

I would think that the conference will also be one vehicle by which the Commission can carry out its statutory obligation to survey library needs of the Nation, to analyze the special problems of providing library services to the urban and rural poor, to minority ethnic groups, and to those for whom English is a second language.

I would hope that the conference will arrive at a reasonably specific but wide ranging series of recommendations aimed at improving and extending the effectiveness of all our libraries.

These recommendations, considered collectively, may well suggest the outline for a comprehensive national plan for meeting the needs of libraries and their users in the years ahead.

I also strongly endorse the concept of encouraging State and regional conferences prior to the national gathering in 1976.

A Governor's conference in each State will permit the sifting and winnowing of ideas to that a distillate, a concentrate of substantive agenda items can demand the full and serious attention of the White House conferees.

The commitment which I, and many other members, have to the National Book Committee does not reflect a professional or occupational interest. But in the aggregate our interest is not unimportant because we are readers, garden-variety users of libraries, and believers in the book.

I hope the Commission will recognize the contribution which readers can make to both the State and national conferences. After all, libraries don't exist as institutional playpens for professionals; they exist to serve people, all of the people.

Of the several areas which are appropriate to the purpose of the conference, I would like to note briefly two which are of particular interest to the National Book Committee.

The first deals with the formidable problem of adequate access by all to a wide range of books and other library materials. The Book Committee believes that a crucial factor in motivating reading, and in building habits of lifelong enjoyment of books, is quick and convenient access to books.

Present efforts by both the public and private sectors, libraries and booksellers, are not succeeding well enough to give reasonable assurance that an individual reader will find a particular book.

Too many bookstores offer only those titles which move quickly and do not or cannot make available older or more specialized titles which, by their nature, have a smaller, usually unprofitable market.

In addition to the "shelf life" of any one title is astonishingly short. Less than best-selling fiction, for example, often cannot be found in bookstores more than a few months beyond publication date.

The libraries are free of the profitmaking constraints of the bookseller, but they have their problems, too. The severe limit on library book budgets means that relatively few copies of popular books can be purchased.

Even in the largest public libraries, a waiting time of 6 to 8 months for a chance to read a book is not unusual.

On out-of-print titles, a different situation exists: There are a substantial number of missing or lost books. Recently, a user of the New York Public Library handed in 10 call-slips for books he needed in connection with an article he had in preparation. After a 50-minute wait, he got all 10 slips back with the following report: 6 were missing, not to be found in their proper location, 2 were in circulation, 1 was an interlibrary loan, and 1 was "out" presumably at a library or being microfilmed.

The net result is that it takes a persistent, highly motivated reader, preferably one with both money and quick reflexes to get the book he wants. I hope the conference and the Commission will give careful study to this question of physical access to books and design specific efforts to answer it.

But physical access to existing books is only one of two related questions. The second is intellectual access. The series of Supreme Court decisions on June 21, later confirmed by the decisions of October 23, have produced a rather complex situation as to the judicial test of alleged obscenity.

Although the entire situation is cloudy, the principal infirmity is in the concept of "community" in determining community standards.

The Book Committee believes that the "community" which must be considered when dealing with allegations of obscenity is nothing less than the community of readers and library users in the United States.

We believe that the range of individual tastes varies as widely within any local geographic area as it does across the Nation. No adult reader should be denied access to a book simply on the basis that other adults find it not to their liking.

This particular problem may be settled, for better or worse, between now and the time of the conference. On the other hand, it may not. Whatever happens on this issue, there is no question that the guarantees provided for in the first amendment will not be secure.

I urge the Commission, the States holding Governors conferences, and the White House Conference planners to give high priority to intellectual freedom generally and to censorship efforts specifically in drafting their agendas.

Second, I call your attention to the existing flaws in the sources of support for our public libraries. The dilemma of the public library is similar to that of the public school and, in some areas, even worse.

The inequitable impact of the local property tax has been widely recognized and it is just this source which provides the vast majority of public funds available for libraries.

It is inherently unjust that the wealthy community, with relatively little financial effort, can enjoy superior public libraries while poorer places, even with much higher tax rates, can muster only meager resources.

I don't pretend to know the answer to these inequities. But surely the solutions rests heavily on the State and Federal Governments, and on the National Commission.

My only purpose today is to call your attention to these inequities and to urge that they be given a high priority on the agenda of the conference.

Other witnesses are more knowledgeable than I am on the other dimensions of the proposed conferences. In closing I would only ask that no legitimate issue facing libraries and their users be foreclosed from free and open scrutiny.

School libraries, academic and research libraries, special libraries and public libraries form a national resource which is essential to the continued vitality of American life.

I commend the committee for conducting these hearings and I am certain that the proposed White House Conference will be a significant milestone in the further development of the American library system.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMANS. Thank you, Mr. Stevens.

Mr. Hoopes?

STATEMENT OF TOWNSEND HOOPES, PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PUBLISHERS

Mr. HOOPES, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Townsend Hoopes. I am president of the Association of American Publishers, which represents publishers of books and related educational materials. Our membership is responsible for more than three-quarters of all the books published in this country.

We endorse with enthusiasm the several joint resolutions before your subcommittee which authorize and request the President to convene a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976—the 200th anniversary of our national independence, and, coincidentally, the 100th anniversary of the American Library Association, an organization we hold in the highest regard. We are pleased to note that the conference would be conducted by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. We also endorse, Mr. Chairman, your own able statement of October 11 which accompanied the introduction of H.J. Res. 776, and we are heartened by the bipartisan support evidenced by Mr. Gerald Ford's similar resolution (H.J. Res. 734). And we note with pleasure that a similar resolution, introduced by Senator Chaborn Poll of Rhode Island, passed the Senate last week.

It is not my purpose this morning to dwell upon the minor distinctions that may exist as between these resolutions, but rather to discuss the substantive matters which, in our judgment, a White House Conference on this subject ought to consider. The belief of our association is that there exists in the Nation an urgent need to explore new information-sharing strategies as these relate to funding library services for all of our citizens. As you have recognized, Mr. Chairman, a combination of economic, social and political forces is seriously eroding the foundations of our carefully structured public library system. Traditional Federal aid to libraries is being dramatically slashed, and this sets a trend for reinforcing reductions in State and local funding. As you know, the President's budget for library sup-

port in fiscal 1973 was \$135.2 million. Congress appropriated the larger sum of \$182 million, but the President vetoed the bill and was not overridden. In the current fiscal year, the President has proposed a zero level budget for Federal library support. Congress has appropriated \$154.7 million, but the ultimate fate of this bill, now in Senate-House conference, remains unknown.

There is little doubt that Federal funding sets the tone for national priorities. And surely our society is suffering a distortion of value judgments when New York City's Board of Estimate approves \$15.9 million, and estimates that an additional \$34 million will be spent to refurbish Yankee Stadium, while the city's urban poor find branch libraries near their homes closed for lack of money. Similarly, here in our national capital where billions of dollars are appropriated for nonintellectual resources, the public library system is forced to discontinue bookmobile and storefront library service in the city's economically depressed areas. The Nixon administration's proposal to withdraw all Federal support from school, college and public libraries threatens to have a direct and devastating effect on our national culture. A White House Conference would greatly increase public awareness of that sad fact; it could also serve to clarify the national purpose and to move us toward better solutions.

It is the view of our association that categorical library aid is absolutely indispensable to insure continuity of services to the established library users—students, teachers, research scholars, businessmen, scientists, technicians—and to extend library services to the disadvantaged, the elderly, and to certain special groups such as those for whom English is a foreign language. Innovative library services to school-children are particularly important ingredients in the right to read effort. Effective programs being carried out under the ESEA title II must not be allowed to atrophy, yet we fear this will certainly happen if this administration can effectively sustain its refusal to spend more than a small fraction of the funds which Congress clearly declared should be spent.

Carlyle called libraries "the university of the people," and broad public access to works of fiction, poetry, science, technology, history and other subjects is heavily dependent upon a healthy library system. Certain important categories of books, including children's books and university press books, are particularly dependent on such a system, for a substantial reduction in library purchases of these makes their publication uneconomical, even where partial subsidy is provided by nonprofit organization. There is no doubt whatsoever that continuation of the sharp reductions in Federal support for libraries will progressively eliminate publication of many important new book titles which are, inherently, limited to small editions and are dependent on the library market.

Publishers and librarians are natural allies in a number of problem areas which deserve the careful examination and planning that a White House conference could provide. Take, for example, the area of postal rates. Here we naturally share with librarians the felt need to prevent excessive increases in book and interlibrary mailing rates, for the consequence is economic hardship leading to cultural deprivation. Even when Congress voted in 1970 to place the postal system on a pay-as-you-go basis, it deliberately retained special lower rates for book mailings—preserving the uniform unzoned rates across the country—

to assure that all citizens would have equal access to intellectual products without discrimination owing to varying distances from the source. At a time when the publishing industry and the library community are once again allied in an effort to stave off a new round of severe postal rate increases, it is particularly important to recall the words of Senator Cranston during the Senate debate which preceded enactment of the 1970 Reorganization Act. He said: "It is basic to our democracy that all of our people have free and easy access to books and other printed materials through our libraries and in our schools. This open circulation of the words and ideas of men is the very currency of our democracy."

It is clear then, Mr. Chairman, that the issue of dramatically escalating postal rates should take its place beside the issue of shrinking Federal library support as burning topics for discussion at the proposed White House conference in 1976. Together they offer to the Congress and the general public two simple, basic illustrations of the economic crunch in which publishers and librarians are caught, the result of which threatens large-scale cultural loss for our entire society.

There is also a third issue, Mr. Chairman, that should be inscribed on the agenda of the proposed White House conference—namely, the citizen's freedom to read. Our association, together with the American Library Association, last year reissued a statement, originally developed in 1953, declaring the joint responsibility of publishers and librarians to make available to the public "the widest diversity of views and expressions" without censorship. It has won the endorsement of more than twenty other professional organizations. Its opening words are: "The freedom to read is essential to our democracy. It is continuously under attack." Indeed the freedom of ideas is continuously under attack, and should anyone wonder whether it is in need of reaffirmation in a national forum like the proposed White House conference, he need not look beyond the recent news dispatch from Drake, N. Dak., where the school board ordered to be burned the works of several distinguished authors, including Kurt Vonnegut, William Faulkner, and Ernest Hemingway. In this case, according to *The New York Times*, not a single member of the school board had read any of the works they voted to ban. It is regrettable that these earnest citizens did not read the final words of the joint ALA-AAP statement: "ideas can be dangerous", it said, "but * * * the suppression of ideas is fatal to a democratic society. Freedom itself is a dangerous way of life, but it is ours".

I stress, Mr. Chairman, our association's support of the proposed White House Conference, because publishers and librarians work cooperatively in many specific ways. A case in point is the "Cataloging in Publication Program," implemented by the Library of Congress in mid-1971 with the cooperation of the Association of American Publishers. Under this program nearly 500 publishers are now voluntarily sending galley proofs and advance copy for books to the Library of Congress for professional cataloging. Full descriptive cataloging is prepared at the Library and returned to the publisher who prints this information in the book. The International Standard Book Number, a unique numbering system now adopted by more than 90 percent of the publishing firms in this country and by many publishers in other countries, is a procedure designed by the book trade that holds great promise for improving the efficiency of book processing in libraries,

especially as regards the ordering and acquisition of new books. Additional mutual efforts are under way to standardize order forms, statistical reporting systems and cataloging procedures.

Also under the aegis of the Association of American Publishers, a limited, experimental program was undertaken in 1972 to help improve the quality of prison libraries. Ten selected prison libraries have received almost \$100,000 worth of current books. One inmate wrote as follows:

I had attended three years of college up until the time of my arrest. I have found that the books here have helped me to keep my sanity. They have helped to fight the boredom and monotony that accompanies incarceration. I have also gotten some of the other inmates to come to the library and use the books here * * * I feel that the benefits of the library cannot be overemphasized or overstated. I would like to express my gratitude and heartfelt thanks for the library and the books which are here.

Without the stimulus of new books, current magazines, and films and tapes, libraries become relatively unused depositories. And without the library market, a wide array of published materials cannot be shared by the great majority of our citizens who, for both economic and geographic reasons, do not have ready access to bookstores. The trend to diverse forms of both formal and informal education and the growing production of creative audiovisual materials both point to the need to increase the utility and effective operation of libraries as an indispensable means of making relevant information accessible to our interested citizenry. As education patterns change, as leisure time increases, as the population grows older, more and better library services are required. Yet the harsh fact is that these growing needs and the funds to sustain them are moving in opposite directions. Public libraries are now open for fewer hours a day, mobile service to outlying communities is being reduced or terminated, and library purchases of new materials are greatly diminished. Without a strong library market, many promising scientists, novelists and poets will not publish at all.

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, the Association of American Publishers urges early enactment of House Joint Resolution 766. Publishers of all types look forward to participating in the proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services, and to cooperating with educators, librarians, politicians and other concerned persons in the preparatory meetings at State and regional levels. As we approach the threshold of the third century of our national existence, it is imperative that we put all of our knowledge to work. There is no doubt that we have the needed talent and technology. But unless we can find the vision and the will to nurture our intellectual resources, following generations of Americans will justly curse us for having squandered a rich heritage.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, very much.

Let me put the same question to both of you and invite your comment on it.

What is the significance in both the short-run and from a more long-run point of view of the recent demise as a supplement of the Washington Post Book World?

Will we now have in the country of over 200 million people only one newspaper as I recall that has a weekly book review published as a separate supplement?

What does that say about books for the immediate future but beyond that for the role of books and publishing in the wider society?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, you have pointed out what I think is probably the most important problem facing young writers today, with all due respect to the New York Times.

Mr. Leonard works for us in the book committee and he is a first-rate man.

But, to have the power to make the great authors, they don't use this power in any way that I would say is selfish but still the power exists.

I think adequate book criticism throughout the country is the greatest need that the young author faces.

I would hope in some of your meetings with the arts and humanities council you would urge that they spend considerably more money in this field.

I so urged one of the heads of one of the large foundations in the country. I think this is a problem for not only the writers but the artists in every field.

They need to receive a hearing for their work. I don't know exactly how you do it, but as you say the Washington Post is giving up their Book World, which is a tragedy.

I don't want to embarrass Mr. Hoopes, but it seems to me the publishers could be helpful in establishing other literary supplements throughout the country if their advertising was spread to papers that would be able to have book sections.

It is a terrible problem and I am glad you brought it up, sir.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Hoopes?

Mr. HOOPES. I think the demise of literary supplements like Book World is the second aspect of a dual problem, Mr. Chairman. If we lose the library market through the failure of Federal subsidies for libraries, a good many promising works of fiction and indeed of non-fiction will never be produced, because their production is uneconomical in the absence of that market. I would thus regard Federal support as the primary problem.

The secondary problem you mention is a very real one, and that is exposure for these literary works. Here I would fully associate myself with what Mr. Stevens just said, including his point that the publishers probably share a considerable part of the blame for not distributing their advertising dollars more broadly.

On the other hand, I think the demise of Book World suggests yet another distortion of our national priorities, for I think that, even if there were substantial increases in advertising, book supplements could not stand on their own as profitable enterprises. I think they need subsidy from somewhere, whether from the newspapers who sponsor them, or from governmental sources. I cannot be sure.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I had not thought about solutions to that problem, either.

It just occurs to me that cable television down the road may well be one of the avenues that holds out some hope of stimulating serious criticism of works of art generally and of books in particular.

Could you gentlemen comment on one other question that I have?

Who ought to be involved in a White House Conference such as that which we are discussing here and in particular the private sector?

Could you just give us any comment on how you see the role of publishers, Mr. Hoopes?

Mr. HOOPES. I have not thought a great deal about that, Mr. Chairman, but the publishers are very much interested in making an intellectual contribution to such a conference. They could work at the State and local levels in the preparatory phase of the Conference. Their participation in the conference itself would be desirable, but subject to further consideration as we approach 1976.

Mr. BRADENAS. Mr. Stevens?

Mr. STEVENS. I would hope Mr. Frantz would answer that.

Mr. FRANTZ. I would hope the conference would include ample representation from the whole spectrum of people who read books and use libraries.

The National Book Committee is almost unique in these hearings in not having any particular occupational commitment to a good system of national library services.

On the other hand, we do represent the reader, the purposeful reader in the public library, the user of computer printouts, the how-to-do-it, and the mystery and science fiction readers.

I would hope the voice of the reader would be heard in this White House Conference.

It is all very well to have computers talking to each other and they deserve each other, but really the library systems exist to serve all of the people whose needs can be met by libraries and other library materials.

Without their voice, I think the White House Conference would be greatly weakened.

Mr. BRADENAS. I appreciated that comment.

I would hope there would be an imaginative effort to bring as many different types of persons as possible into this picture and that perhaps would be responsive to the criticism that was voiced by Mr. Carlucci that this was somehow a very narrowly focused enterprise.

Certainly the testimony you have given us here indicates how very broad the spectrum the conference is and I was especially impressed, Mr. Hoopes, by your suggestion and Mr. Stevens made the same point. We should get into the question of the first amendment right to read.

Gentlemen, thank you very much.

Mr. Hansen?

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Let me express my appreciation for very constructive testimony. I would like to pursue briefly the last question the chairman referred to, and that is the freedom of citizens to read which you referred to in your testimony.

It seems to me this can be one of the most useful functions that a White House Conference can serve to highlight that issue and perhaps to detail many of the ways we burn books without touching a match to them, many more subtle and more sinister than perhaps the more open and direct way of burning it in the fire.

My question is: How can we better safeguard and reinforce that right?

Are there some statutory protections that we ought to be initiating that would help?

Is it a matter of interpretations by courts of the applicable laws apart from the understanding of the importance of this?

Are there some positive steps that might be taken by public officials to help secure that right?

Mr. HOOPES. Mr. Hansen, I am sure you are aware of the rather unfortunate decisions of the Supreme Court last summer on the issue of pornography and obscenity which, by their very nature, have invited the States and, indeed, local communities, to set their own standards.

The Association of American Publishers has taken the rather categorical position that the first amendment should be allowed to stand on its own feet, that it cannot be improved upon nor our freedoms enhanced by any legislation. Nevertheless, we are likely to see a proliferation of restrictive local laws and regulations and this incident in Drake, N. Dak., is simply one example.

It seems to me the defenders of the freedom to read are going to have to be especially active and vigilant in the next year or so, if we are to change the climate which produced the decisions of the Supreme Court last summer.

I don't think additional laws will help. I think quite the contrary—that the elimination of unnecessary laws and the return to something approaching a national standard for judging what is decent are what we need.

Mr. HANSEN. You say initially resisting the inevitable move of the passing of laws in the wake of the Supreme Court decision would be useful?

In other words, rather than the passage of new laws or attempts at statutory safeguards, we can serve a purpose by resisting what would likely be the actions of legislatures, city councils, and so forth, in passing new laws implementing what they believe to be the authority granted them at least under the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. HOOPES. Yes; I would agree completely with that statement.

Mr. BRADEMANS. Gentlemen, thank you very much to all three of you for your most helpful testimony.

The Chair wants to say that gentleman from Michigan, the Hon. William D. Ford asks that his statement be subsequently submitted for the record.

[The statement referred to follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM D. FORD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate having the opportunity to present my views to you today on H.J. Res. 766, a resolution calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

A White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976 is a concept I wholeheartedly endorse, and I congratulate the distinguished chairman for introducing the resolution providing for this conference. I would also like to commend the chairman for his long time interest and activity with respect to library legislation. He has been a major contributor over the years to the development of landmark library legislation such as the Library Services and Construction Act, Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title II of the Higher Education Act, and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act of 1970.

A nation conference on libraries, with widespread grassroots participation of Americans from all parts of the country and from all walks of life will provide just the forum we need to reevaluate our nation's libraries and the services they provide all Americans. This reevaluation is urgently needed today because the Nixon administration has placed us on the threshold of a major reversal of established national policy in support of an organized and coordinated system

of library services in the United States. It has done so by recommending no funds for the major federal library programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education. Fortunately, Congress has not agreed with the budget recommendation for libraries, and we have appropriated substantial sums for the library programs in the FY 1974 Labor-HEW appropriations bill (H.R. 8877). Libraries are by no means out of the woods, however, because this administration has a record of impounding library appropriations that is surpassed by no other administration throughout our history.

Established national policy on libraries is clearly set forth in the following provision of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act of 1970 (PL 91-345):

The Congress hereby affirms that library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people of the United States are essential to achieve national goals and to utilize most effectively the Nation's educational resources and that the Federal Government will cooperate with state and local governments and public and private agencies in assuring optimum provision of such services.

President Nixon on July 20, 1970, signed these words into law as a carefully considered statement of enduring national policy. It was a policy supported by both political parties, by both houses of Congress, and the Executive Branch during both the Johnson and Nixon administrations.

This law recognizes a profound national interest in adequate library services, a national interest greater than the sum of the interests of individual states, communities, and institutions. Implicit in the law is the recognition of many aspects of that national interest:

That bringing educational opportunity to children, particularly disadvantaged children so that they can break through barriers of poverty and discrimination, requires school libraries with an abundant choice of reading and special instructional materials;

That not only students and faculty but the whole nation gains from the strength of the learning and research resources of college and university libraries;

That each of our great research collections is a national resource deserving national support;

That only thorough our library systems can most Americans have meaningful access to the enormous intellectual and information resources embodied in the tens of thousands of books annually published and the hundreds of thousands from prior years that are actively in use;

And finally, that only through a nationally conceived system can all of our libraries be linked to serve our national needs efficiently and economically.

I was fortunate to be able to meet with a group of concerned citizens recently to discuss the crisis presented by the proposed termination of federal library funding for college, school, and public libraries. At this meeting, we developed a statement on the crisis, which I have requested to have included in the official hearing record on the proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

Because the present assault on library funding is contained in so many different bills and titles and affects so many kinds of institutions, its total impact has been hard to grasp. The White House conference will allow Americans to reexamine their neighborhood libraries as well as the great research and national libraries. It will provide legislators the information they need to develop more effective library legislation in support of national library policy. Nationwide debate on access to information and the role of libraries in providing it is needed more than ever today for we are faced with an unprecedented crisis in confidence on the part of the American people toward their government which has withheld vital information from the people. Libraries are a unique information-providing resource belonging to all the American people. Their potential is largely unexplored. Their problems are many and diverse.

A White House Conference on Library and Information Services will enable us to make an intelligent and far-reaching appraisal of these problems and for this reason, I strongly urge the prompt passage of H.J. Res. 766.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We will also include in today's record a copy of House Joint Resolution 734 and House Joint Resolution 766.

The subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]

[The following material submitted for inclusion in the record.]

SHOWMANSHIP NEW TACTIC TO FIGHT LIBRARY DECLINES

(By Eric Pace)

New Orleans has been putting on puppet shows, Pittsburgh has offered investment advice, and there's a place in Oakland, Calif., that has been giving out Mexican food. Attleboro, Mass., has featured folk singers and Baltimore County has produced motorcycle repair lessons, while Rockville, Md., has found a deft fellow who demonstrates how to tune up a Corvette.

The local notables who have arranged all these free attractions are not impresarios, not travel agents, not tavern owners trying to drum up trade. They are the new breed of that venerable species, the American librarian, and they want to repair their shrinking circulation figures and tune up their relations with their communities.

"Libraries are changing," said Mary Ann Landry, a branch librarian in Jefferson Parish, La. "The hushed tone is gone and the idea is that they should be inviting places; people should feel relaxed."

Innovation, hospitality, showmanship and sometimes outright gimmickry have invaded the marble halls of the nation's libraries, a coast-to-coast survey by New York Times correspondents shows.

Yet many of the dozens of librarians who were interviewed in recent weeks said that the jolliness and ballyhoo did little to offset their other worries, which include security, budget problems and the Nixon Administration's desire to cut back Federal funds.

"Libraries in the old cities—in places like Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore and New York—are caught with a deteriorating tax base, and it seems to me that in the long run it's going to take Federal aid to keep them healthy," said Dean Richard Darling of Columbia University's School of Library Service, "but in Washington we have an Administration with very little concern about the libraries; I'm alarmed."

The big city libraries need large sums of money to keep going because they operate on a vast scale. The New York Public Library, for instance, has a budget of \$32 million a year, and the Chicago Public Library spent \$16 million in 1972, compared with \$7.7 million a decade ago.

And the libraries continue to lend enormous quantities of books, pamphlets and other items—4.3 million last year in Pittsburgh, for instance, and 9 million in Chicago.

Yet in many cities lending figures are on the decline. The total in Chicago has fallen off from 9.3 million in 1967 and 10.2 million in 1962.

"Of course our circulation of books is dropping, as it is in all large cities," said the Chicago public library's chief librarian, Alex Ladenson. "That doesn't mean our service is diminishing, but that the large cities are getting more people who are picture- and car-oriented, rather than word-oriented."

POPULARITY OF TELEVISION

"And then there is a decline in purely recreational reading because of the popularity of television," Mr. Ladenson went on. "People escape through the tube now, not through escapist fiction."

On the other hand, Mr. Ladenson said, the circulation of "notebook items" is increasing, and last year 3.5 million people saw at least one of the films in the library's collection. The use of photocopying equipment in Chicago library branches is also on the increase, which indicates, he said, that "people aren't checking books out, but photocopying the parts that are useful to them."

Smaller library systems have made simpler innovations. New Orleans has been offering, in addition to the puppet shows, story hours for preschool children, free movies at night, instruction in crafts, exhibits of paintings and photographs and book discussion groups.

Once patrons are lured into a library nowadays, librarians are increasingly reluctant to "shush" them as they did in earlier decades when no-talking rules were rigidly enforced.

"We like to think we're not as stuffy and stuffy as libraries used to be," observed the New Orleans librarian, M. E. Wright, Jr. "The only standard we set is that no one should bother anyone else."

DISCIPLINE A PROBLEM

Yet discipline remains a problem in many libraries. Staid old Attleboro suffers from a traditional kind of vandalism—carving on tables.

Librarians in Portland, Ore., Baltimore and elsewhere reported an increase in recent years in the number of books taken out and then not returned, while Dr. Peter Aby of the Oakland public library system reported an increase in unusual behavior by patrons. Accordingly, Oakland librarians have been ordered to work in teams of two at small branch libraries and have been given training in how to deal with unruly or irrational persons.

In New York, a Public Library executive said rowdiness "is a tremendous problem in the branches; in some of the more difficult situations, we've had to close down a branch for a day or even sometimes for a year until the kids who are doing the harassing grow up or find something else to do."

Budget problems are hamstringing operations in the New York system and in many, although not all, cities around the country.

The New York Public Library, which serves Manhattan, the Bronx and Staten Island, has been reducing its services for the last three years. At the Jefferson Market branch in Manhattan, the librarian, Philip Gerrard, complained, "We are totally unable to provide all the services we need. There's not enough money to buy new books, or enough to replace ones that are worn out."

The library system relies heavily on outside contributions, and last week its president, Richard W. Couper, said he was cheered by the offer of a \$1-million "challenge" grant for the system's research libraries from the National Endowment for the Humanities. To be eligible to receive it, the library must raise twice the amount from other sources, but Mr. Couper said there was a good chance of success.

Many smaller libraires are engaged in similar cutbacks of services and scrambles for funds.

And around the country, librarians' fears about funds have been heightened by Nixon Administration budget cuts. The Administration's latest budget proposals, made public earlier this year, make no provision for Federal funds for libraries during the 12 months that began July 1, although more than \$160-million in Federal funds was appropriated for local, state and other libraries during the preceding year.

After protests from librarians and other interested groups, the House passed a bill authorizing about \$170-million in funds for libraries this year, and the Senate is expected to do the same this fall. But there is fear that President Nixon will veto the legislation, and that his veto will not be overridden.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, D.C., December 4, 1973.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,

Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your recent request for a report on H.J. Res. 766 and H.J. Res. 734, two bills "To authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Sciences in 1976." The bills are similar with the exception of one item noted below.

The purpose of the Conference would be to develop recommendations for the improvement of libraries and information centers. The conference would be composed of librarians, information specialists, educators, relevant technologists, and representatives of the general public. (H.J. Res. 766 would also include representatives of Federal, State and local governments.)

Planning and direction of the Conference would be carried out by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science with cooperation and assistance from all Federal departments. The Commission would make technical and financial assistance available to the States for preparatory meetings and conferences and prepare background material for the use of delegates on the Federal and State levels.

Within 120 days of the close of the Conference, a report would be submitted to the President and the Congress. Ninety days later, the President would be

required to submit to Congress a statement of recommendations regarding the report.

A 28 member advisory committee would be appointed by the President to assist the National Commission in planning and conducting the Conference.

Both bills would authorize such sums as may be necessary to carry out the terms of the resolution.

In certain circumstances, a White House Conference may serve to fill a need for the exposure and examination of critical and neglected problems of national concern. However, we do not believe there is any need for a White House Conference in an area where existing forums are providing an adequate opportunity for the identification and discussion of issues and ideas.

We recognize that there are important issues in the field of libraries and information science. Access to information is necessary for an enlightened technological society. The dissemination of information is an area where we must always seek improvements.

However, we do not believe that the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Sciences, as proposed in H.J. Res. 766 and H.J. Res. 734, is justifiable.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no evidence of critical unresolved issues in libraries and information science that cannot be handled through the existing channels of communications in the field, i.e., professional associations, meetings of civic groups, and governmental and legislative processes on all levels. Further, the activities described in both bills to be conducted by the proposed Conference would duplicate the responsibilities of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Secondly, we think that a White House Conference solely on the subject of libraries and information science would be too narrowly focused, both in terms of the prestige of such a conference and in terms of the considerable public expenditures necessary for such a conference. This is not to diminish the importance of libraries and information science but it does indicate that we believe that these subjects should be examined as a part of the broader issue of education.

We therefore oppose the enactment of H.J. Res. 766 and H.J. Res. 734, as not being needed.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Secretary.

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHORS LEAGUE OF AMERICA

The Authors League of America is the national society of professional writers and dramatists.

The League supports H.J. Res. 734, which requests the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Centers in 1976. Obviously, authors of the books, journals, and magazines which libraries and information centers distribute, recognize the importance of these institutions and the need for careful planning and coordination of their services in light of the potential inherent in their use of advanced technology.

However, The Authors League respectfully submits that there is one serious weakness in the Resolution which should be remedied. *Section (b) (2)* provides that "The Conference shall be composed of, and bring together" representatives of (A) library and information systems, (B) educational institutions and organizations, (C) experts in technology, and (D) the general public. We respectfully submit that publishers and authors, as separate categories, have as vital an interest in the proceedings and outcome of the Conference as librarians or educators.

History teaches us that the same technological advances which benefit society can—mishandled—also create serious new problems. The gasoline engine gave millions of Americans greater mobility and produced mass employment. It also produced deadly pollution and clogged highways, and destroyed mass transit which must now be recreated at great expense. Rockets can carry men to the moon, and nuclear warheads to every city on the globe. And, the computer permits us to process information on a scale and with a speed hitherto undreamed of—and to invade the privacy and personal rights of countless citizens on the same enormous scale.

Similarly, improvements in reprographic machines and computerized information systems will transform libraries and information services. However, misapplication of this new technological capacity by library networks and information systems could destroy the present system of independent entrepreneurial authorship and publishing—transferring their vital functions to national library networks and information centers substantially subsidized by government. In recent years authors and publishers have had ample evidence that some library spokesmen cannot or will not recognize the damage which library misapplication of technology can inflict on our present system of independent writing and publishing of information.

The Authors League submits that *Section (b) (2)* of the Resolution should be amended to provide that "The Conference shall be composed of, and bring together—

- (E) representatives of publishers of scientific, technical and other books and journals; and
- (F) representatives of authors."

The Authors League respectfully urges that spokesmen for such organizations as the American Chemical Society, the American Institute of Physics, and the American Society of Testing and Materials, can contribute much to the Conference, as representatives participating actively in its proceedings along with librarians and educators. These societies and other private concerns now publish the great majority of scientific and technical journals, the primary means of disseminating the vast quantity of needed information in their fields. The views of these learned societies and other publishers, on library uses of new technology in the dissemination of information, do not coincide with those expressed by spokesmen for several library organizations and information centers. On the contrary, representatives of these various groups testified last July before Senator McClellan's Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights concerning problems created by technology's impact on the functions of libraries, information centers and publishers. Spokesmen for the learned societies and publishers and for librarians and information centers voiced sharply different opinions on these questions which will so vitally concern the Conference.

While libraries play an important part in the dissemination of information it should be remembered that the primary and indispensable function of disseminating information is performed by the authors and publishers of scientific and technical books, journals, monographs and other publications. Libraries and information services actually perform a secondary function which would be impossible today were publishers to cease publishing. One major issue in the debate between publishers and authors, and librarians is whether the unbridled library applications of the new technology threaten to destroy the present structure of independent publishing, replacing it with government-subsidized information networks composed of libraries and information centers.

The Authors League also believes that authors who create the books, journals, articles and monographs which libraries ultimately help to distribute, after publishers publish them, also should be represented at the Conference, as a separate category. The rapid developments in reprography and computerized information techniques will have a tremendous effect on the profession of writing in all areas. Moreover, The Authors League is deeply concerned with freedom of expression. And one of the primary questions for the Conference should be the effect of these new technological developments on freedom of speech and press, and the freedom to read. As large information networks develop they will pose vital First Amendment problems—e.g., the author's right of access to the information-dissemination networks, to communicate his writings to the public; protection of authors against censorship by the systems' managers; and the public's right of access to the materials stored in the systems.

For all of these reasons, we respectfully urge the amendment of H.J. Res. 734, to add to the categories to be represented at the Conference: (E) representatives of publishers of scientific, technical and other books and journals; and (F) representatives of authors.

IRWIN KARP, *Counsel*.

STATEMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

To the Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: The Association of Research Libraries, a professional organization numbering as its members the major research libraries of this country, appreciates the opportunity to present the views of the Association on the proposed White House Conference on Li-

Library and Information Services, and asks that this statement be made a part of the record.

It has been said that we are moving from the Age of Energy to the Age of Information. In view of present shortages, this may be just as well, for the untapped resources of information are as limitless as the human mind can make them, and depletion is not one of the problems. Rather is it a matter of effective exploitation and utilization of knowledge, and positive assurance of its ready availability to all persons. To many citizens, the notion never occurs that libraries or books or information are matters of concern requiring study, planning, support, management, systems design and rather sophisticated expertise. Yet, as the Committee is quite aware, all too many of our countrymen still have poor or even no access to library facilities, though much has been done until recently to correct this failing. The libraries in whose behalf I speak are not poor institutions, representing as they do the investment of many millions of private and governmental dollars. Yet their richness is at once their present and growing handicap, for this precedent of completeness and the dependence upon them as major intellectual resources can no longer continue in the past and present mode. Rather searching reexamination of ultimate objectives and national needs is urgently required, if our information facilities are not to continue to deteriorate under the corrosive effects of rapidly rising costs, unmanageable quantities, uneven pressures for access and other negative conditions.

While research libraries share many problems with other types of libraries, certain areas are of particular concern and, indeed, many have been the subject of Association investigation and action, both past and present. In some respects, these problems relate to the distinctive size, complexity and character of research libraries. However, the solutions, when achieved, will be rather universally applicable. Typically, the research library deals with appropriate disciplines through comprehensive coverage, both in scope and in retrospective depth. Its acquisitions tend to be specialized, to have originated in most countries of the world, to be difficult and expensive to obtain, to require unusual language and subject capabilities for initial selection and cataloging, and are often subject to deterioration because of age or poor quality of manufacture. Such collections are relatively unique to a given institution and demand careful bibliographic identification and records of their existence and content. Indeed, past growth of such collections has been and still is due, in part, to the lack of adequate national provision for creating such records and content analysis, thus requiring scholars to have the materials immediately at hand for personal examination. Since the materials are not widely held, fairly substantial demands are made on the owning institution by outside scholars and commercial users. With respect to organizational management, some degree of automation is commonly found in many large libraries, usually developed and applied by the institution itself, uniquely in each case.

The foregoing description goes into some detail, not to astound the innocent but to illustrate a complexity fraught with problems, many of which are common to all libraries and for which solutions are now haphazardly sought at the local level. It is our contention that full national access to recorded knowledge is better served by elevation of problem-solving to a higher, more broadly applicable level. Indeed, the ARL has initiated and participated in such contributions, including comprehensive studies of microform technology and utilization, the development of permanent/durable papers, and the analysis of conservation techniques. Support has also been generated for the National Program of Acquisitions and Cataloging at the Library of Congress, to relieve individual libraries of much expensive and redundant cataloging effort. Application of computer technology to library problems is not an altogether simple matter, since management of bibliographic data bases is surprisingly more complex than business-oriented information systems. The Association has been closely involved in development of such data bases, particularly the National Serials Data Program now under way at the Library of Congress.

Of concern to all citizens, and to the libraries which serve them, is the matter of access to information—the seemingly simply process of getting one's hands on the needed book or report or journal article. The traditional procedures of printed catalogs and indexes and the mutually supportive interlibrary loan activities are no longer adequate to cope with the varieties of needs and the extraordinary increases in operating costs. A number of studies of interlibrary relationships and loan systems have been made or are under way, with the ARL having been instrumental in several of them. Much more needs doing, to achieve a rational and economically feasible system which ensures the maintenance and accessibility of the total information record.

It seems increasingly certain that such a system must be conceived on a national scale. Cognizance must be taken of existing resources, possibly incorporating them into our system, as Great Britain is presently doing with its so-called British Library. This may, for example, bring the designation of certain institutions as National Centers of Excellence, with federally guaranteed maintenance and nationally based service obligations. The creation of new resources may also be envisaged; among such possibilities are one or more periodicals resource centers, which will provide fast, assured availability of this difficult-to-control medium of communication. Feasibility and alternatives studies of such centers are already under way. The proposed White House Conference will provide welcome opportunity for the necessary interaction between the various types of libraries and library systems sure to benefit from and be involved with such new facilities.

The implementation and the financing of a reoriented and nationally based system pose challenges of considerable magnitude. The concept of the management of research libraries in the aggregate, in the context of national objectives, is one possible and wholly new approach. The individual library takes on a responsibility to some entity other than its own parent institution or governing body, and its channels of support and modes of service are modified and supplemented. In addition, participants in any national "research library corporation" (to project one version) will gain an enhanced capability for dealing with and achieving results on problems beyond the power base or expertise of any single institution or small group. Such thinking represents a change in the direction of support, from federal funding of local facilities to provision of nationally based services and resources on which the local outlets may draw. While the local assistance must certainly continue to be assured for the time being, in due course the centrally established and shared resources will enable savings in individual libraries which may well more than offset loss of subsidies and will certainly extend the total spectrum of available publications and ease of identification of and access to needed information.

There are, in effect, two directions which support may take. The first provides assistance to the local retailer of information, who deals on a one-to-one basis with the minds which make this country move. This retailer can and has dealt with information in bulk, packaging it as best he could, as well as buying expensive prepackaged services as he was able to do so. The alternative direction is greater investment in the wholesale area, in the interface between the producer and the library retailer, to ensure the quality and availability of needed products, at prices which the retailer can afford. Not only is information considered as potential energy; it has also been characterized as the new capital on which our economy and our society subsist. Our two investment opportunities may thus be viewed as the bankrolling of outlets on the one hand, and the basic production of capital goods on the other, by which is meant the processing, packaging, labelling and distribution of information. By the same philosophy which sees to it that transportation is increasingly guaranteed to the nation, our planners should recognize the urgent priority of guaranteeing on a national scale both bibliographic and physical access to recorded information and the knowledge represented therein.

Not all libraries have arrived at or will subscribe to this way of thinking, this view of the future, and indeed there will be many proposals of equal or greater cogency. What is needed above all is the fullest opportunity for professional and public consideration, discussion, understanding and support, taking into account the whole panoply of issues and possible solutions.

In this regard it is somewhat ironic to learn that the White House Conference has been considered by some as being unnecessary, that existing Federal agencies, particularly the Office of Education, can provide the President with the needed guidance in this area.

This is a curious and fanciful suggestion in view of the precipitous retreat from library activities that in recent years has characterized the Bureau of Libraries of the Office of Education. Libraries and information activities are not the sole province of education; at times it appears that the Office of Education may not consider libraries as a part of education at all. Effective national leadership can hardly be expected from an agency that denigrates its own mission.

Information interests are growing in every segment of society and every segment should have the opportunity to provide ideas for the national discussions and decisions in this area. A government agency cannot be substituted for the grass-roots response required at this time.

It has also been argued that the White House Conference would preempt the activity of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The

work of the Commission cannot approximate the benefits to be expected from a Conference. The Commission has a staff of two persons. In the two years the Commission has existed the level of accomplishment has been excellent in proportion to the manpower available, but the manpower is wholly inadequate to the task of gathering independently and in a finite amount of time the recommendations and the data that would emerge from a White House Conference.

Finally, it has been averred that the proposed Conference has a focus that is too narrow to be of consequence to national goals. In reality every sector of society and all of our national goals can be served by the recommendations and results of such a Conference. Interests in the areas of agriculture, health, economy, ecology, science, technology, arts, humanities, business, government, and education are among those whose concerns would benefit from the Conference. Far from being "narrow in focus" the information needs of the present encompass everyone and every component of our society. To assist the nation in addressing their needs, the Association of Research Libraries heartily endorses the proposed calling of a White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

In a further elaboration of Association interests and concerns as they relate to the proposed White House Conference, we wish to supplement this general statement endorsing the Conference with additional comments. These comments were prepared in August 1973 as part of a presentation made to the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education.

This statement represents our best thinking on an area of critical concern—the financing of research libraries—an area which, we would hope, would be given special attention at a White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

THE FINANCING OF THE RESEARCH LIBRARY—A DISCUSSION PAPER PRESENTED BY THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

In 1967 the American Council of Learned Societies published the following statement: "Research libraries may be defined as institutions whose collections are organized primarily to meet the needs of scholars and so to facilitate effective action on the frontier of every field of knowledge, traditional and novel . . . At their best they are notable for the variety and depth of their holdings and for the quality of research that they support."¹

These relatively well stocked libraries make an indispensable contribution to higher education and research in every section of the country and indeed in all parts of the world. The research library is typically a university library similar to the 81 which are members of the Association of Research Libraries. Much of what we say applies also to certain major non-university libraries which hold some of the world's greatest research collections, such as the New York Public Library and the Library of Congress.

The 78 university libraries who were members of ARL in 1971-72 had in their collections from 700,000 (Rice) to 8,700,000 volumes (Harvard). In 1971-72 they added to their collections from 34,000 (Howard) to 387,000 volumes (Harvard). Most of them maintain as well large collections of manuscripts, microforms, and other library materials not reflected in the count of printed books. These figures alone may serve to indicate that these libraries are quite different from most of the thousands of libraries which support the educational activities of two-year colleges and even the best four-year liberal arts colleges.

It is often said that universities exist for the preservation of knowledge, the transmission of knowledge, and the creation of new knowledge. The university library is deeply involved in all those functions. Aside from oral tradition and the physical monuments of art and architecture, libraries are essentially the sole repository of recorded civilization, and only the large research library performs the preservation function in anything like a comprehensive way. Collectively these libraries are the memory of mankind, organized so that it may be drawn upon as needed today and in all of our tomorrows, whether man requires information recorded at the dawn of history or only yesterday.

These libraries are essential also to the transmission of knowledge and the teaching function of the university. A simple skill, such as woodworking, may be passed on without recourse to the written word. More sophisticated disciplines

¹ *On Research Libraries: Statement and Recommendations of the Committee on Research Libraries of the American Council of Learned Societies, Submitted to National Advisory Commission on Libraries, November 1967.*

(e.g., technology, science, philosophy, economics, literature), at least as essential as simple skills to the advancement of civilization, are obviously built upon and transmitted to a considerable extent through the intellectual discourse of books and serious journals. Even at the undergraduate level, education of any quality seems to require sending the student beyond the lecture-plus-single-textbook process to exploration among many printed or pictorial sources. Economy alone prescribes that these sources be shared through a library.

Graduate education demands much greater resources. Various studies indicate that graduate students use from three to five times as many books as undergraduates, as well as a far greater variety of books and other kinds of recorded information. The kind of library we are discussing is likely to be found in the universities whose graduate and professional programs have been identified in the American Council on Education and other surveys as possessing excellence. Indeed, in the 1966 ACE report, *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education*, it was noted: "The library is the heart of the university; no other single non-human factor is as closely related to the quality of graduate education . . . Institutions that are strong in all areas invariably have major national research libraries."

While the market for Ph. D's in many fields may be temporarily glutted, the continuing health of much postsecondary education will obviously require continued doctoral training of quality, if only to provide competent staffing for thousands of colleges and universities. It is interesting to note that the 78 universities which were members of the Association of Research Libraries in 1971-72 produced 23,885 or 69 percent of the estimated 54,600 doctoral degrees (excluding law and medicine) awarded that year in the U.S. and Canada. (This is another way of saying that a great deal of graduate education is concentrated in a relatively few large universities, as it should be in terms of the economics of the situation.)

The third function of the university, the creation of new knowledge, is shared with other institutions, such as the government or industrial laboratory, for example, but it is clear that it is a major function and the element which most obviously distinguishes the university from the college, the vocational institution, and other types of educational institutions. It is equally clear that most research demands major library resources. In nearly all fields new knowledge is developed only after a careful sifting of what is already known and work in the field or the laboratory is interspersed with work in the library. In some fields the books in the library are themselves the sole material of research.

The point which we wish to emphasize is that the three functions of the university are inseparable and the library is essential to all three. That it exists to support the university is only part of the ecological balance, for it can be said also that the university exists in part to support the library. These relationships have an important bearing upon any discussion of the financing of research libraries and of education.

The university library and, even more, the independent research library have important relations outside the university. Almost all of them, under a variety of arrangements, provide important resources to industrial research laboratories, government agencies, independent scholars and the whole range of organizations and activities that comprise the web of American society. These libraries are collectively the capstone of the pyramid of information resources.

Together they constitute a single national resource of great importance. Increasingly, and of necessity they are sharing and pooling their resources, for no library can have everything. It has been estimated that by 1974-75 the magnitude of loans of materials that will be made by academic libraries to other libraries would approximate 2,600,000 at an estimated cost in the order of \$12.1 million. Typically the university library lends to other smaller libraries four or five times as much as it borrows.

A variety of devices, national and regional, has been developed by librarians for bringing the combined collections of the research libraries under bibliographic control, for telling where a particular book may be obtained. The *National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints*, now being published in an estimated 600 large volumes, supplements the ongoing current record by indicating holdings, mostly monographic reported over the past 70 years of more than 800 libraries throughout North America. The NUC is one of the keys to that vast national resources represented by the combined collections of libraries. (Incidentally, with some 250 volumes already published, through the letter "H", the project is facing serious financial problems.) The rapidly developing computer-based technology will al-

most certainly provide the basis for bibliographic control in the future through a national library communication network.

Librarians have for years been thinking of the total research library collections of the country as a single national resource. In 1940 Julian P. Boyd, then Librarian of Princeton University, stated the issue succinctly: "The fallacy of an impossible completeness in any one library should be abandoned in theory and practice; librarians should now think in terms of completeness for the library resources of the whole country." Soon after, Dr. Boyd was one of the leaders in proposing and developing the Farmington Plan, under which some 50 librarians have accepted responsibility for specific fields and geographic areas in an attempt to bring to the country at least one copy of each book of potential research interest from about 150 countries and territories.

This program is now being phased out and the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging of the Library of Congress, authorized by Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965, is beginning to achieve the objective of the Farmington Plan. NPAC, or the "shared cataloging" program, had its inception in the recognition of the substantial economies which could be realized if each book could be cataloged once only and the cataloging copy made available promptly to all other libraries acquiring the same book. Its import has been tremendous, even though NPAC has never been fully funded by the Congress.

One more example among many may be cited to suggest the way in which libraries are sharing their resources and serving students and scholars by drawing upon collective strength. The Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, which had its origin in 1951, is an independent "library's library," supported by its more than 100 institutional members. Its function is to collect and make available important but seldom-used materials so that each individual library will not have to preserve such things as newspaper files, which are essential but not called for frequently. Currently, with the aid of a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the Center is conducting a pilot program of subscribing to several thousand seldom-used journals in the hope that individual member libraries may find it possible to rely on the Center for these titles and thus increase their available resources and stabilize the heavy load of carrying individual subscriptions. One model for such an activity is the highly-successful National Lending Library for Science and Technology, supported by the British government as a national resource.

Many other examples could be cited. However, it should already be clear that the university libraries and a few rather similar national and independent research libraries constitute a major national resource, a *de facto* network creating a vast pool of recorded knowledge and information essential to education and to the advancement of learning without which modern society could not exist. This network has evolved unsystematically and without adequate planning and its links are at present quite imperfect, but we are beginning to see the emergence of a coherent, integrated whole. Its viability will depend upon a judicious balance between centers of local excellence, immediately accessible to users, and a variety of centralized cooperative activities, integrated through a computer-based system of bibliographic control.

In all of these developments and activities the objective has been to provide what users need at a cost which is bearable, for a large university library is an expensive proposition. In 1971-72 the 78 libraries upon which we have been concentrating spent a total of more than \$76 million for the purchase of books, periodicals, and other materials. Since the associated staff costs of acquiring, organizing, preserving, and interpreting large library collections tend to be about twice the amount spent for purchases, total library expenditures of these 78 libraries in 1971-72 were \$260.5 million, not including great capital expenditures for housing library collections and operations.

It may be easier to comprehend what has happened if one looks at the actual dollar expenditures of a single university library. For the Princeton University Library actual annual expenditures over the past 25 years increased as follows:

	1947-48	1972-73
Books, periodicals, and binding	\$100,000	\$1,400,000
Salaries and wages	190,000	2,400,000
Total library expenditures	317,000	4,100,000

It should be noted that Princeton is an old and stable library, in an institution which has not seen the enormous growth of the great state universities. The library's rate of growth has been one of the slowest among ARL libraries, and it is not one of the largest in the group. In 1973 it was 17th in the number of volumes held among U.S. and Canadian university libraries.

Costs of this magnitude are impressive and alarming, but their significance lies more in the rate of growth which they represent. Statistics are available for 58 university libraries which have been members of the ARL throughout the period 1950-1969. For these libraries the average annual rate of growth was 10.5 percent over the twenty-year period. It should be underscored that this rate of growth represents an annual compounding, and that the power of compounding is such that at this rate a variable doubles in size in less than seven years and in *two decades grows to about eight times its original size.*

The principal causes of this growth in costs include not only general inflation and higher salaries but also several special library factors:

1. The increase in university enrollment (probably less significant than the other factors).

2. The expansion in the scope of teaching and research programs.

3. The rapid increase in the worldwide production of recorded knowledge. For example, in 1947, 7,807 new hard-cover books were published in the United States; in 1972, 26,865. To maintain the same relative sample of this information, without regard to new fields of study, libraries must increase acquisitions proportionately.

4. An increase in the unit cost of publications considerably in excess of general commodity indices for the period. For example, note the following average list prices of U.S. publications:

	1947	1972
New hard-cover books (per volume).....	\$3.62	\$12.99
Periodical (annual subscription).....	3.59	13.23

We suggest that in the light of this evidence the financial problems of the university libraries and the related non-university general research libraries merit national attention. While these libraries occupy numerically a small portion of the broad spectrum of educational activities, this is a particularly significant segment. Libraries of this type are an absolutely essential element in a very substantial amount of undergraduate collegiate education. Perhaps more important, they are even more essential to the advanced and professional education and research upon which the nation depends. One cannot conceive of a modern society without the steady infusion of highly-skilled manpower and creative thinking which only the university can provide, and one cannot conceive of a university of quality without library support of equal quality. Beyond formal academic walls, these libraries collectively are a single national resource of recorded knowledge organized for use, the collective memory of mankind, constantly being applied to improving the quality of life today and tomorrow.

We recognize that this very involvement of the research library with so many aspects of education, with a complex blend of teaching and research, makes it difficult to develop a single satisfactory plan for financing libraries. University libraries have been supported by a variety of federal, state, and private funds. They have received a share of the general funds of their parent institutions, whether derived from state legislatures, endowment income, tuition, sponsored research overhead, or annual gifts from alumni. Some have separately endowed funds, and most receive direct gifts and grants from individuals, foundations, and corporations for specified activities. They have received categorical assistance directly from the federal government, such as the grants for acquisitions under Title II-A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, or as part of federal support of specific programs, such as the NDEA foreign language centers. Some charge nominal fees for certain kinds of services, such as service to industry. We trust that all of these kinds of support will continue. We urge, however, that special attention be paid to library problems as new patterns of university financing emerge.

There have been discussions of general institutional support, by which federal aid would come to the institution in a lump sum, to be distributed by the insti-

tution according to its own needs. If the library were merely a service agency, bounded by the specific needs of specific classroom activities, merely placing books on reserve for assigned reading, such a program might be fairly effective. But the university library has a multitude of other functions and relationships not bounded by the walls of a single institution. Furthermore, while institutional autonomy may be generally a worthy objective, in the case of the university library it runs directly counter not only to quality of service, for no library can have everything, but also to sensible economy, for it is becoming increasingly clear that one of the most promising means of slowing the growth of library costs is the sharing of resources among institutions.

There have been discussions of student support, by which much of the funding of institutions might come from tuition grants from the government which the student might bring with him to the institution of his choice. This plan has the great merit of encouraging free choice. Yet university library costs are related much less directly to numbers of students than they are to factors such as the number of fields offered, the nature of each field, the quality of the collections, and above all the research element. For adequate university library support to be derived entirely in this way the student grants would have to be quite large indeed. Furthermore, it would be difficult to adapt this method of funding to the highly desirable support of the great independent research libraries which are in important element of the single national resource which has been described.

We believe, therefore, that some form of categorical aid is probably essential for university and research libraries. For too long the aid which they need has tended to slip away because through the multiplicity of their involvements this aid has always seemed to be someone else's business. They need direct and massive support as libraries, or rather as elements of a single national inter-related network of libraries, an essential national resource.

We believe further that, while grants to individual libraries are useful and welcome, they are not necessarily the most economical and rational way of solving the problem of the rapid exponential growth of university library costs. Perhaps the most effective kind of assistance is massive aid applied centrally to whatever operations facilitate sharing, and thus relieve individual institutional funds to do what must be done locally. A variety of opportunities at the federal level suggest themselves:

Legislation already exists which has done much and could do much more if fully funded under existing authorization and under increased authorization. The shared cataloging program of the Library of Congress (NPAC) has saved university libraries millions of dollars in cataloging costs and could save millions more if adequately funded and expanded.

The distribution of machine-readable catalog copy on computer tapes (MARC) could be quickly extended to additional categories of books and made a free service to libraries by appropriate action of the Congress.

The development of the national computer network could be accelerated by the substantial investment of federal funds in developing a series of related networks, perhaps along the lines of the Ohio College Library Center or other tested model, which would as a federal service provide individual cataloging from MARC tapes and from pooled original cataloging to the major libraries of the country.

The staff costs of acquisitions and cataloging consume as much as one third of the annual budgets of university libraries. By applying federal funds centrally for programs such as those outlined above, substantial savings for individual libraries might be achieved.

In a quite different area, the creation and operation at federal expense of one or perhaps several special libraries to which research libraries could turn with confidence for the loan of journal articles, on the model of the British National Lending Library for Science and Technology, would provide for access by individual libraries to tens of thousands of scholarly journals which might otherwise be unavailable to them.

We have attempted to identify the nature and functions of the large university research library, to indicate the special role these libraries play in the education and the life of the country as a unified national resource, to suggest the formidable costs and the rapid exponential growth involved, to discuss alternative forms of financial support, and to suggest examples of centralized federal assistance which might be given.

Again, these areas which are critical to the welfare of the country, require attention at the national level. We feel that the proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services would provide the most appropriate forum for such a discussion.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., November 26, 1973.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and
Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for giving us an opportunity to comment on H.J. Res. 734 and H.J. Res. 766, which you and Mr. Ford have introduced.

We wish to be on record as endorsing enthusiastically the proposal to convene a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976. The word crisis is so overworked these days that we may have to invent another to convey any real sense of urgency. Yet it is a quite appropriate word to use in describing a situation where demand for information seems to be outstripping our ability to supply it.

There are no easy solutions; if there were, there would be no need for a Conference. For example, amazing technological developments of the past few decades offer means of storing and transmitting information in ways never before available, and yet their indiscriminate use could well destroy future sources of information. Somehow all parties concerned—producers, custodians, and users—must be brought together to wrestle with the problems. A White House Conference would seem to be a promising approach.

The timing of your proposal is particularly fortunate. The days when a few Andrew Carnegies, and later state and local supplementary sources, could provide the needed financial resources for adequate library and information services are past. We pretty well established this concept in the 1960s. Yet the concept is now under challenge, as it is the case of many of our great (and expensive) national resources. It would be our hope, and our expectation, that a White House Conference might sort out the problems and straighten out our thinking.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. MORSE,
Director.

STATEMENT OF PROF. WALTER ADAMS, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

On behalf of the 90,000 members of the American Association of University Professors at 2,300 institutions, I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement to the members of the Subcommittee in support of the resolutions currently before the House authorizing and requesting the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

The American Association of University Professors is the largest and oldest professional association of college and university teachers, librarians, and academic counselors. Our long-term support of libraries and librarians within the academic community has been most recently manifested in the *Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians*, which was drafted jointly by our Association, the Association of College and Research Libraries, and the Association of American Colleges. I have appended a copy of the *Joint Statement* and I commend it to the members of the Subcommittee for its succinct description of the appropriate roles of college and university libraries and librarians in the educational process.

A White House Conference on Library and Information Services, with the attendant State Conferences provided for in the House resolutions, would permit librarians, representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments, representatives of educational institutions, agencies and organizations which provide library and information services, professional and scholarly associations, and of the general public, and persons with technological knowledge and competence to focus sharply on the current goals of diverse types of libraries and to explore their future needs, goals, and policies. Libraries represent a major national resource. They play a major and significant role in strengthening the educational programs which we believe are in the national interest. As a nation, we are at a critical point in the development of our libraries and a White House Conference, coming during our Bicentennial Year, would serve to provide both an assessment of past experiences and a set of objectives for the future. We strongly endorse, therefore, both the proposed format and expressed purposes of the White House Conference.

For college and university libraries, the White House Conference would provide the opportunity to evaluate their current roles and to project their future integral

relationship to the educational process. Libraries on campuses continue to expand their holdings and increase their services even during the current period of relatively slower growth of full-time enrollments. However, the new emphasis on expanding postsecondary education and the continued rapid growth of community colleges have led to increased demands for library and information services. Instead of arbitrarily restricting the growth of libraries, it appears to us that the next two years could be spent profitably in discussing the problems in meeting the growing demand and their probable solutions. Both the proposed State meetings and the White House Conference can provide the forum in which those discussions may occur.

In reviewing the resolutions currently before the Subcommittee, we agree that the National Commission on Libraries and Informational Science should assume primary responsibility for planning and coordinating the White House Conference and that the Commission should call upon other Federal departments and agencies for assistance. We welcome the provision in House Joint Resolution 766 providing for assistance to the Commission from the Library of Congress. We would recommend that the House Resolution provide at a minimum an authorization of \$10,000,000, which should remain available for obligation until expended.

We endorse the goals expressed in both of the resolutions before the Subcommittee and we would urge early action in amending the provision on authorization to conform with the authorization provision already approved by the Senate. We are pleased to note the bi-partisan support for a White House Conference and we commend the members of the Select Subcommittee on Education for their concern. We urge early approval by the Subcommittee, the Committee on Education and Labor, and the House in order that the Commission may begin the planning necessary for the Conference.

Thank you for your kind invitation to present this statement on behalf of the American Association of University Professors in support of the proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

[Reprinted from AAUP Bulletin, Winter 1972]

JOINT STATEMENT ON FACULTY STATUS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS

[The following statement has been drafted by the Joint Committee on College Library Problems, a national committee representing the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Association of American Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors. The statement has been officially endorsed by the Board and Annual Meeting of the Association of College and Research Libraries and is being considered by the AAC and AAUP. Publication of the statement was authorized by AAUP's Council at its meeting in October, 1972. Members, chapters, and conferences are invited to review the statement and transmit comments to the Washington Office]

As the primary means through which students and faculty gain access to the storehouse of organized knowledge, the college and university library performs a unique and indispensable function in the educational process. This function will grow in importance as students assume greater responsibility for their own intellectual and social development. Indeed, all members of the academic community are likely to become increasingly dependent on skilled professional guidance in the acquisition and use of library resources as the forms and numbers of these resources multiply, scholarly materials appear in more languages, bibliographical systems become more complicated, and library technology grows increasingly sophisticated. The librarian who provides such guidance plays a major role in the learning process.

The character and quality of an institution of higher learning are shaped in large measure by the nature of its library holdings and the ease and imagination with which those resources are made accessible to members of the academic community. Consequently, all members of the faculty should take an active interest in the operation and development of the library. Because the scope and character of library resources should be taken into account in such important academic decisions as curricular planning and faculty appointments, librarians should have a voice in the development of the institution's educational policy.

Librarians perform a teaching and research role inasmuch as they instruct

students formally and informally and advise and assist faculty in their scholarly pursuits. Librarians are also themselves involved in the research function; many conduct research in their own professional interests and in the discharge of their duties.

Where the role of college and university librarians, as described in the preceding paragraphs, requires them to function essentially as part of the faculty, this functional identity should be recognized by granting of faculty status. Neither administrative responsibilities nor professional degrees, titles, or skills, *per se*, qualify members of the academic community for faculty status. The function of the librarian as participant in the processes of teaching and research is the essential criterion of faculty status.

College and university librarians share the professional concerns of faculty members. Academic freedom, for example, is indispensable to librarians, because they are trustees of knowledge with the responsibility of insuring the availability of information and ideas, no matter how controversial, so that teachers may freely teach and students may freely learn. Moreover, as members of the academic community, librarians should have latitude in the exercise of their professional judgment within the library, a share in shaping policy within the institution, and adequate opportunities for professional development and appropriate reward.

Faculty status entails for librarians the same rights and responsibilities as for other members of the faculty. They should have corresponding entitlement to rank, promotion, tenure, compensation, leaves, and research funds, and the protection of academic due process. They must go through the same process of evaluation and meet the same standards as other faculty members.¹

On some campuses, adequate procedures for extending faculty status to librarians have already been worked out. These procedures vary from campus to campus because of institutional differences. In the development of such procedures, it is essential that the general faculty or its delegated agent determine the specific steps by which any professional position is to be accorded faculty rank and status. In any case, academic positions which are to be accorded faculty rank and status should be approved by the senate or the faculty-at-large before submission to the president and to the governing board for approval.

With respect to library governance, it is to be presumed that the governing board, the administrative officers, the library faculty, and representatives of the general faculty will share in the determination of library policies that affect the general interests of the institution and its educational program. In matters of internal governance, the library will operate like other academic units with respect to decisions relating to appointments, promotions, tenure, and conditions of service.²

STATEMENT OF IRVIN P. SCHLOSS, COORDINATOR OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS,
AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to present the views of three national organizations vitally interested in programs serving blind persons on H.J. Res. 766, which authorizes a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

The three national organizations I am speaking for are the American Association of Workers for the Blind, the national membership organization of professional workers in services to blind persons; the American Foundation for the Blind, the national research and consultant agency in the field of work for the blind; and the Blinded Veterans Association, the Congressionally chartered membership organization of the nation's war-blinded. All three support enactment of H.J. Res. 766.

A White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976 would perform an invaluable service to the nation by focusing public attention on the state of the art at a critical time in our history. As we enter a post-industrial technological age, a national White House Conference, and state and local conferences to prepare for it, will enable the public to participate

¹ Cf. 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure; 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings; 1972 Statement on Leaves of Absence.

² Cf. 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, formulated by the American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

In the process of taking stock with regard to our libraries, information centers, and information sciences, particularly in light of the information explosion and technological advances for storing, retrieving, and communicating information since World War II. A White House Conference will enable our national leaders in both the Congress and the Executive Branch to evaluate our progress in the development of library and information services, determine future needs, and plan for the systematic implementation of ways to **meet those needs. It is time for long-range planning in this country in many areas of our national life instead of ad hoc responses to crises, and a White House Conference on Library and Information Services can serve as the beginning point in such a long-range planning process in this basic aspect of our national life.**

Adequate library and information services are essential concomitants of adequate education. They are the *sine qua non* of a vital democratic society. Technological advances in the past 30 years have already revolutionized information services for the mass public and for special groups. FM radio, including sub-carrier transmission; high fidelity tape recording and speech compression; VHF, UHF, and closed circuit television; simultaneous teletypsetting in various parts of the country of newspapers, periodicals, and books; rapid photocopying and teletransmission of photocopied materials; computers; communications satellites—these are some of the technological advances which have or can be utilized in a worldwide network of library and information services.

A White House Conference on Library and Information Services should also consider the needs of special groups, such as the blind and severely visually impaired, who cannot read ordinary printed material; the deaf, who cannot use auditory information systems; handicapped individuals who cannot handle or manipulate ordinary printed material and must utilize projection devices, page turners, or auditory reading systems; the homebound, who cannot get to and from libraries and information centers owing to severe mobility limitations; and others, like individuals with specific learning disabilities, who might benefit from a variety of information modalities if they were readily available. Therefore, we would strongly recommend that the planning committee for the conference schedule special concerns sessions to deal with these specific problems; and we would urge this Committee to include language calling for special concerns sessions in its report accompanying H.J. Res. 766. Similar special concerns sessions at the recent White House Conference on the Aging were effective in focusing attention on the needs of special groups.

In conclusion, we urge prompt and favorable action on H.J. Res. 766 with the report language we have suggested. A White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976 would be an appropriate way to commemorate the bicentennial year of the American Revolution. It would be a fitting tribute to the founding fathers of this nation, who firmly believed that an informed electorate is essential to the successful functioning of a democracy.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR INFORMATION SCIENCE

The American Society for Information Science (ASIS) strongly supports H.J. Res. 734, H.J. Res. 766 and related resolutions to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Sciences in 1976. In supporting the resolutions, ASIS also strongly endorses the policies and statements set forth in the preamble to the joint resolution. Further, ASIS actively seeks a role in planning and participating in the Conference and in making the subject expertise of its Members available to the conferees.

The Resolution heavily emphasizes the importance of advanced and modern technologies for the further improvement of access to and dissemination of information in the Nation's libraries and information centers. Essential requirements to this improvement are the training and continuing education of those who operate and manage these information systems and the education of those who use the services and products of the systems. We strongly urge the Conference to address itself to these areas.

In addition, we suggest that the Conference deal with the nature of information problems anticipated in the future, in elaboration of those mentioned in the resolution. These problems will demand solutions on a radically different and broader scale than we have now. The following future information problems may be expected:

The complexity of social structures and problems is increasing; as a result, the complexity of information requirements is increasing as well. However, the ability of information systems to satisfy these complex requirements is not keeping pace but rather seems to be decreasing;

The human social order is in a transition period from the industrial to a post-industrial society; there is an increase (to the point of dominance) in types of work requiring higher education; knowledge is becoming the most important social force and knowers (professionals, technicians, managers, etc.) the most important social group; as a result, communication and management of knowledge will be one of the most essential areas of the new post-industrial society, requiring new concepts for many types of information systems;

More specifically, policy-making and management related to the environment may become one of the most important factors in the survival of our civilization; since rational policy-making and management is based on information, we may expect an increase in demands for special kinds of new information systems related to policy-making and management;

In highly developed societies, everyday life is becoming more complicated and each of us, as an individual, increasingly demands all kinds of information to function; furthermore, as we are becoming a people more and more assured of equality in goods and services, we start seeking new services related to quality of life and new modes of participation in social processes . . . for all this we will need new types of information systems specifically oriented toward the general populace, not only toward the intellectual elite.

The American Society for Information Science is a non-profit national professional association of nearly 4,000 Members concerned with the development and application of advanced technology that contributes to the more efficient use of existing information. ASIS is dedicated to the improvement of the information transfer process through research, development, application, and education. The Society acts as a bridge between research and development and the requirements of diverse types of information systems. It provides a forum for the discussion, publication, and critical analysis of work dealing with the theory and practice of all elements involved in the communication of information.

The Society has a diverse membership reflecting the pioneering and changing aspects of an emerging subject. Its Members include information specialists from such wide-ranging fields as librarianship, management, linguistics, operations research, computer science, psychology, symbolic logic, data processing, communications, economics, mathematics, education, and other disciplines concerned with information handling. Members are employed by universities, the information-products industry, government agencies, computer manufacturers, software companies, research institutes, and a wide variety of other types of organizations.

In supporting the joint resolution, we wish to emphasize that ASIS is heavily represented in many of the subject areas that will undoubtedly be discussed during the White House Conference. Since one of the aims of the Society is to bring people together from different levels—the theoretical, experimental, and practical, and from industry, government, and academe—we view the scope and purpose of the proposed White House Conference as very similar to those of the Society itself.

ASIS is eagerly looking forward to participating in the White House Conference on Library and Information Sciences and contributing toward the success of this significant event.

STATEMENT OF ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY

The Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT), represents eight thousand educators whose aim it is to improve the educational environment available to learners at all levels through the application of technology to instruction. Our members have a wide range of responsibilities including the study, planning, application and production of communications media for instruction. They are employed in schools and colleges; in the Armed Forces and industry; and in museums, libraries and hospitals. It is important to note that our members interpret educational technology as more than machines and equipment. Rather, it is a process, rooted in learning theory and communications research, that enables a learner to learn more effectively and efficiently.

In first reading H.J. Resolution 700, I was impressed by the statement that "... access to information and ideas is indispensable to the development of human potential, the advancement of civilization, and the continuance of enlightened self-government." I couldn't agree more with that statement. This is something we in the educational technology field have stressed for many years. We feel our job is one of getting information to individuals in as effective a manner as possible.

However, the second paragraph of the Joint Resolution leaves me at a loss. Certainly the preservation and dissemination of information and ideas are the primary functions of libraries, but libraries are not the sole repository of information. Information storage, which requires people to come to that storage area and rifle through vast quantities of information to find what they need, is a disservice to the public today.

Knowledge is no longer confined to the printed word and preserved between book covers. Technology for the creation, processing and transmission of information has been vastly extended in the last decade.

At this point we should be looking beyond libraries to the larger question of how our society's information needs are to be met in the future—perhaps to a network of communications. Certainly libraries would be a part of this network concept, but the network would extend beyond the library—even the library in its present conceptualization as an "information center." In a paper developed for a Conference on Interlibrary Communications and Information Networks, Dr. Robert Heinrich, Professor of Education and Instructional System Technology at Indiana University, made the following point:

The blue sky of the papers dealing with the technology of information handling clouds over somewhat when future social implications of networks are discussed. For example, we tend to assume that libraries will be the focal points of networks. This is not at all certain. Other networks exist, (the telephone, cable television, etc.), others will, and the structure that may evolve may be a thorough mix of several or all of them. Cable television, in private hands, could become the dominant network, in terms of the public, with library network nodes as ancillary suppliers. At the other end of the transmission spectrum, satellite systems may become the meta-network, subsuming many earthbound networks. (If I may mix metaphors, McLuhan's global village is on the horizon. Becker and Olsen (1968) in defining a network presuppose the existence of units waiting to be interconnected. This no doubt is true now but the dynamics of information handling will generate the units to be joined. Peter Drucker (1968) sees knowledge as one of the major growth industries of the future; if he is right, private enterprise will likely move in to dominate this aspect of networking." I have quoted extensively from Dr. Heinrich's paper because his vision of the meeting of information needs offers more promise than a mere consideration of reorganizing or in some way modifying present libraries.

Granted, a networking system such as I am describing is a radical departure from what we know now and will require rethinking many areas from our copyright laws to public financing of education.

The impact of a communication's network could be especially great on today's formal education. With a network instruction would become available wherever a terminal is located. Information and learning would become accessible to those who cannot or do not wish to participate in formal education—whether it is someone looking for specific information to prepare themselves for the next rung on the career ladder; a student studying a subject not available at his local school; or a handicapped person not able to travel to a formal educational setting.

The question that arises is where will the terminals be located. Libraries (particularly public libraries) are one logical choice—they are widely distributed and could provide the necessary atmosphere, both social and academic.

Let's speculate about the possibilities of such a networking system. A national curriculum group could design a course using interrelated series of films, programmed instruction, books or other educational formats permitting self-study by individuals or small groups. The films would be available over cable TV. The related programmed instruction would be available at the end of a terminal in a public library or other institutional setting. Assessment and accreditation of learners could be turned over to a group like the Educational Testing Service or American College Testing and carried out over the same terminals. Tuition could always be collected by credit card!

I realize many of these ideas seem rather fantastic at this point. Granted a radical change such as we are considering is in the future. But it is not too soon to start preparing for that time. Some institutions have already made steps in

that direction. Hiwassee College in Madisonville, Tennessee, has established a learning resources center including a communications laboratory with a multimedia capability. The library is providing many of the resources for the center. Through the center, students can dial access to remotely located tape programs and hear that program through a headset. The laboratory can receive and record overseas broadcasts.

A closed circuit television system was designed so that the three major networks, one PBS channel and one channel of the campus station are accessible in all classrooms. The library functions as the center of the total television programs—origination, production, distribution of campus originated programs; and the transmission of the network. The college is now expanding the cable distribution system into all existing buildings on campus. "Send-Receive" outlets will be installed in all buildings so programs can be originated everywhere on campus. They also plan to increase locally produced programs as well as daily campus news and educational programs. Eventually, they hope to tie all dormitory rooms into the system. The librarian of Hiwassee College, Ken Yamada, said in a recent article, "It is hoped that the library will eventually become part of an electronic information exchange network among depositories throughout the country and the world."

I do not wish to denigrate the idea of a White House Conference on Libraries and Information Centers. As you can see from the above example, libraries can play an important part in the future. But I am suggesting we look toward the future in broader terms. Perhaps a White House Conference on Information Technology would be more appropriate. At the least, the ideas presented should be carefully considered and explored as part of the substance of any conference. This would get at the vital importance of "access to information and ideas (that is) indispensable."

I know the Committee is aware of the importance of the future of educational technology as well as the future of libraries since both fall under your jurisdiction, and I hope my remarks will be helpful to you in developing legislative initiative that will enhance the relationship between libraries and educational technology.

COALITION OF ADULT EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., November 16, 1973.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is my pleasure to advise you that the Coalition of Adult Education Organizations at its regular meeting on November 15, 1973 endorsed the calling of a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

In addition to other reasons, we believe this would be an important contribution to the Bi-Centennial Year.

Very truly yours,

LEONARD P. ARIES, *President*.

STATEMENT OF JOHN G. LORENZ ON BEHALF OF THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION
OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS

I appreciate the invitation, as Chairman of the Local Planning Committee for the 1974 General Council Meeting of the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), to submit a statement on H.J. Res. 734 and 766, authorizing a White House Conference on Libraries and Information Science in 1976.

The International Federation of Library Associations, a nongovernmental organization founded in 1927 and supported partially by UNESCO funds, has several important objectives related to such a Conference: to promote cooperation in the field of librarianship and bibliography and to carry out research and development projects concerning the international relationships between libraries, library associations, bibliographers, and other organized groups.

IFLA has continuously worked towards the principles for which it was founded and has made significant achievements toward the development and improvement of library service world-wide as well as in the United States. Specifically, IFLA was very helpful to the Library of Congress in achieving the cooperation of other national libraries and national bibliography centers in developing and carrying out LC's international shared cataloging program. This program was

created through the foresight of the House Committee on Education and Labor in Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and is commonly known as the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging (NPAC). NPAC answers the national need for effective and efficient centralized cataloging and eliminates costly duplicative cataloging by individual American libraries. The NPAC program has been received with great interest and enthusiastic response both nationally and internationally and has been hailed as one of the historic library developments of the 20th Century.

For many years IFLA has also worked toward international agreement on cataloging principles, developing international standards relating to library statistics so that statistics reported from various nations can be compared and historic and valuable agreements on inter-library loan and exchange of document principles.

IFLA has also worked toward the improvement of international transfer of machine-readable information and has organized meetings of experts, which included representatives of the Library of Congress, to develop standards to make it possible for users to recognize the elements in a bibliographic record, regardless of language. This would facilitate the conversion and exchange of these records in machine-readable form on an international scale and form the basis for Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC) which is now one of IFLA's major objectives.

IFLA was one of the international associations which joined UNESCO in sponsoring the International Book Year in 1972. This program helped reveal that libraries play a major part in overcoming the dividing lines between nations by bringing books and their knowledge to the peoples of this world.

As reflected above, the United States has also provided considerable leadership and talent to the work of IFLA. Considerable interest has already been expressed by members of IFLA on the planned White House Conference. The White House Conference would represent a most significant and in many cases an unparalleled and historic effort toward achieving an effective and efficient national system of library and information services. Through IFLA, the planning and accomplishments of such a national conference might serve as a model for the entire world.

The 40th General Council meeting of IFLA to be held November 16 to 23, 1974, in Washington, D.C., will mark the first time this organization has met in the United States. The theme of the meeting is "National and International Library Planning." Anticipated attendance of delegates and observers is 1,000-1,500 representing over 75-100 countries of the world. The meeting could serve as a very effective springboard for disseminating the initial plans for the White House Conference. The results could well be similar planning in other countries for nation-wide development of library and information services. Several nations have already begun taking significant steps in this direction, e.g., the United Kingdom with the development of the British Libraries plan and similar plans of West Germany and Japan. Presentation from these countries are already being planned for the Washington conference. These plans illustrate the growing belief that the effective dissemination of information will be one of the decisive factors in the future growth rate of nations. I trust that at the Washington conference in 1974, United States representatives shall also be able to speak with definitiveness about the plans and programs of the National Commission on Libraries and Information and the White House Conference in 1976.

INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION,
Newark, Del., November 26, 1973.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: While the Select Subcommittee on Education will doubtless hear much expert testimony from professional library groups on H.J. Res. 734, H.J. Res. 766 and other resolutions on the desirability of requesting the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, it is perhaps appropriate for the International Reading Association, an organization representing 60,000 teachers of reading, to underscore the importance of such a conference.

Libraries are of prime importance in the development of reading abilities of many kinds. In most situations, teaching a child to read where there are no

library facilities is tantamount to teaching him to swim where there is no body of water in which he can continue to practice and develop his swimming ability. Libraries which provide a wide range of materials for the stimulation of readers are an inseparable aspect of the teaching of reading.

But we are not only interested in libraries for their instructional value. The storage and retrieval of information, as this service is performed by libraries, is of inestimable value to those of us who use the findings of research in our study of reading. Not only is the enormous potential of the electronic revolution in information retrieval before us, but the application of the principles of the new technology to information science is in great need of study and use.

A White House Conference on Library and Information Services could serve the future in many ways, and the International Reading Association's members would welcome such a meeting.

Very cordially yours,

RALEIGH C. STAIGER,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

JOINT COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS,
Washington, D.C., December 3, 1973.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you for the opportunity to submit a written statement in regard to the proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services. My views for the record follow:

I am Frank W. Norwood, Executive Secretary of the Joint Council on Educational Telecommunications. The JCET was founded in 1950 by a number of leading nonprofit, nongovernmental educational organizations because they recognized that the then-new communications technology of broadcast television held great potential for the educational and cultural life of the nation. As the Joint Committee on Educational Television, the JCET led the successful effort to have the Federal Communications Commission reserve broadcast channels for non-commercial television.

Over the past twenty years, the JCET has continued to serve as a bridge between the education and communications communities and to help explore the potential for education and information dissemination of such emerging communications technologies as cable and satellites. The American Library Association is a consistent member of the Joint Council and the field of library and information services is clearly one which can reap substantial benefits from developing communications technologies. Pioneering efforts are already under way by libraries which are using cable television to increase service to their patrons. A project in information resource sharing by satellite is now in the planning stage for the joint U.S.-Canadian Communications Technology Satellite which NASA will launch in 1975. The enormous value of the computer for libraries and information centers has been demonstrated in countless instances.

It is important to note that the benefits offered by new technology cannot be fully realized unless and until all parties at interest are fully informed. Communications specialists need to know more about the nation's information needs and the expanding role of the library. Librarians and information scientists must be kept informed regarding emerging technologies and their capabilities. Leaders in the Congress and at such regulatory agencies as the FCC must be informed as to the policies which will best facilitate the application of technology to our information needs, and the same informed concern must be present at state and local levels.

New technology, particularly in the field of communications, is developing more rapidly and over a wider front than ever before. The necessity for making wise decisions based upon knowledge and sound understanding grows increasingly critical. A White House Conference on Library and Information Services could provide an important means for focusing attention on such matters of continuing significance. I am sure that the other organizations which are members of the Joint Council on Educational Telecommunications would be happy to join with the American Library Association in supporting such a White House Conference and contributing to its work in every appropriate way.

Sincerely,

FRANK W. NORWOOD, *Executive Secretary.*

MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, INC.
Chicago, Ill., December 5, 1973.

Mr. JOHN BRADEMAs,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Medical Library Association appreciates the opportunity to comment on H.J. Res. 734 and H.J. Res. 766. The Association would express interest in the calling of a White House Conference on Library and Information Services whenever such a conference would be scheduled, as a logical extension of our charter purposes. But we feel that a conference would have particular importance in 1976. As the nation enters a period of relative austerity, there is little doubt that its priorities must be more carefully identified and selected.

For both the public and the congress, the need to support programs of growth and development in the library and information service area has been less visible and certainly less dramatic, than needs in national program areas having a seemingly more direct interface with the important problems of today. However, it is not difficult to demonstrate the essential component of information services in all areas of national priority. This is particularly evident in the health sciences field, from the standpoint of health care delivery, education and research. Technological development, the exponential growth of new information and the recent emergence of many difficult questions relating to the financing, planning, administration and use of information services suggest that a national forum is indicated now. In the absence of such a forum, costly disorder, inefficiency and deterioration in the communication and transfer of information is likely to occur.

A White House Conference would be one meaningful way of helping to assure that important considerations in this broad field are brought to public and congressional awareness. In addition, since the Congress and executive branch will need to exercise increasing discretion in the planning and support of future national programs in library and information services, a current determination of priorities is important. Knowledge of these priorities is also of increased importance at the state and local levels as a result of the broad ramifications of revenue sharing.

The Medical Library Association wishes to call to the attention of the Select Subcommittee on Education the fact that there is great diversity within the Library and Information Science field. This needs to be recognized in the structuring of the Advisory Committee to the Conference which will be appointed by the President. It is of crucial importance that on the occasion of a White House Conference, no segment of the field be neglected. Finally, the Medical Library Association is ready to recommend individuals who could serve capably on the Advisory Committee as representatives of health sciences library and information services.

Respectfully,

SARAH C. BROWN, *President.*

MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
December 3, 1973.

Mr. JOHN BRADEMAs,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. BRADEMAs: As President of the Music Library Association, I strongly support the joint resolutions (H.J. Res. 734; H.J. Res. 766) urging the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

Such a conference offers a fine opportunity for the exchange of ideas among various divisions of library work as well as the chance for special library groups such as MLA to make their information more readily available to other specialists and to the general public. In such a proposed conference, participants will have a unique opportunity to plan cooperatively and to learn, hopefully, how to better integrate and disperse the overwhelming amount of general and specific knowledge available through libraries.

The scope of the White House Conference—bringing together librarians, educators, Federal employees, and representatives from the general public—and the advance support to permit preparation, will certainly give a new and needed dimension to the role of libraries in this country.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES PRUETT, *President.*

STATEMENT BY MILES MARK FISHER, IV, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

My statement is in support of H.J. Res. 734 and H.J. Res. 766 authorizing and requesting the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976. The year of the bicentennial of this nation is an appropriate year for such a dialogue.

The recognition of the fundamental importance of libraries and information services and the bringing together of the various levels of leadership and the users of these services for discussion is both necessary and essential.

A free society is as strong as the available library and information services that are accessible to its citizenry. Libraries and information systems are fundamental to our pre-school education, elementary education, secondary education, postsecondary education, higher education, vocational and technical education, continuing education, corporate and industry education, and leisure.

Libraries and information services are a critical part of the resources of the academic community. In institutions of higher education, accreditation is necessarily related to the availability of library and information services; that an institution has the capability to provide to the general community.

In the historically black institutions of higher education there is need to continue the support and upgrading of library and information services. These developing institutions need a certain level of library and information services in order to maintain their accreditation. As the hub of an institution, the library system is very important for the continuation of a certain level of viability.

With today's information explosion it is important that those who provide such services come together to assess this phenomena as resources in libraries are fundamental to solving the educational, scientific and cultural problems of today.

There are five observations that I would like to share with you in response to these resolutions, namely:

1. This conference must be responsive to the diverse nature of the users of these services and resources;

2. This conference must not only be composed of and bring together the special interest groups at different levels but must be truly representative of these groups;

3. The Advisory Committee established shall consist of and be representative of the diverse persons who make up the population of our nation;

4. All other advisory and technical committees necessary to carry out the Conference should be truly representative of the various groups of persons within our society; and

5. Any recommendations from this Conference should take into consideration the diverse publics that are served by the library and information services.

The Joint Resolutions calling for A White House Conference on Library Information Services should be supported and implemented with the help of all interested persons and groups.

STATEMENT OF KENTON PATTIE, VICE PRESIDENT AND EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR, NATIONAL AUDIO-VISUAL ASSOCIATION

The National Audio-Visual Association is a national trade association of communications professionals dedicated to the increased and improved use of audio-visual communication at all levels and in all walks of life. NAVA enthusiastically supports House Joint Resolutions 734 and 766 which authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on library and information services in 1976. But such a conference should not merely be a tribute to the nation's advances in the past 200 years; it should be a springboard for rethinking the role of a most fundamental institution in our land.

All of us know that today's library is a distant cousin of the 1940's stereotype of a dimly lit, hush-hush bastion housing rows and rows of perfectly aligned dusty volumes. To the contrary, it is a bustling hubbub of all kinds of activity, both learning and leisure. The Dewey Decimal system may still reign; students are still writing research papers. But alongside the "traditional" library activities like these are adults borrowing films, tapes, and phonograph records and people learning languages autotutorially. Saturday mornings may mean a movie called "A Ride on a Garbage Truck" for pre-schoolers; on Saturday night, a movie on retirement living for senior citizens. Unfortunately, though, this pic-

ture is not universal; nor is it all it could be—which is why the National Audio-Visual Association would like to see a national Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

We have all known for a long time that education does not take place in a vacuum; that it means more than rote memorization from a textbook; that no single institution has full responsibility for education; that learning is both formal and informal; that it takes place in and out of school. Recently, we have been saying that teacher-and-textbook-dominated teaching is not the only way, that the more actively the learner is involved the better he or she learns. Individualization, inquiry, and independence have become watchwords.

The library, information center, media center, or learning resource center—whatever the name—has a unique mission in this “new view”. It can be a primary instructional center, in a school or in a community. It can offer individual or group opportunities for learning; it can offer almost every conceivable method of learning; it can offer a storehouse of ideas, and an endless “information treasure hunt”. As the American Library Association and the National Association express it in *Standards for School Media Programs*:

The media center's program, collections, and environment provide a broad spectrum of learning opportunities for large and small groups of students as well as for individual students. The focus of the media program is on facilitating and improving the learning process in its new directions—with emphasis on the learner, on ideas and concepts rather than on isolated facts, and on inquiry rather than on rote memorization.

Libraries could be the core of a community. The 1971 White House Conference on Youth stated it this way:

... educational media centers should be established which have community-wide responsibility for the planning, design, production and acquisition of teaching materials. These materials should be disseminated by a variety of delivery systems, (radio and TV broadcasting films, cable TV, audio, video and film cassettes) and made available to learners ... Such a communications system, built as an integral part of these learning centers, could make the cultural and educational resources of the community available to support and strengthen existing educational institutions and training centers. These systems would also make teaching materials available to individuals or groups in the home, also to the neighborhood.

Libraries, however, have not had the resources to take on this mammoth mission or to keep pace with today's communications-information-technology revolution. Said the Carnegie Commission in 1972:

Until recently, our pattern of independent library establishment serving neighborhoods, communities, schools, colleges and special interests of various kinds has appeared adequate to the nation's needs, but now the situation has changed. The information revolution has completely overwhelmed some of the smaller and medium-sized library establishments and they have abandoned all hopes of keeping up with it.

The concept of storage of knowledge has become vastly complicated, let alone the notion of how the information seeker can best get the information sought.

A national conference calling together all persons who care about libraries—from academicians to building trades people, from information specialists to child psychologists, from audio-visual publishers to municipal budget officials—could focus on the myriad of questions which are the “sore thumbs” of this view of the library. Questions like—

How can the information explosion be best recorded? How can the rapidly growing field of information in nonprint forms be assimilated into collections traditionally organized to accommodate print forms?

How can the library best serve the many needs of the community? Should it become a single, unified source for stored information?

Why is there no comprehensive inventory of the Nation's information resources? Why are existing information centers underutilized? Why are there inequities in our delivery of information services?

How can we best achieve our goals in an orderly, efficient, coordinated manner?

What are the social, economic, and psychological implications of all this?

If we decide where we're going, how will we pay for all this?

Why do we in the audio-visual field care what happens to the nation's libraries? We agree with Edward L. Katzenbach, a businessman who has said, “Technology has tended to flow around the world of education.” We envision technology “flow” at the heart of learning—because that's where it belongs. And when we say technology, we mean, as the Carnegie Commission has described

it, "The enrichment and improvement of the condition in which human beings learn and teach achieved through the creative and systematic organization of resources, physical arrangements, media, and methods."

The big question in our view is not "what technology?" or "when?" The basic question is: Where is education going? Unlike business, industry, and government, we are not at all sure that education has gotten to the fundamentals, arrived at basic objectives, or found an inspiring sense of purpose. As one leading educator, Fred T. Wilhelms, has put it, "What we are after is a nationwide thinking through of basic purposes and the development of a compelling set of priorities—compelled not by any external authority but by the sheer force of its ideas."

The questions are not what technical devices, print or nonprint, will support and augment learning. The question is learning for what? When this question is answered, and then the secondary one of what should the library do, technology will be there and will be ready to facilitate those purposes. Again, we agree with Mr. Wilhelms: "It is no use polishing the brasswork of the machinery; what has to be done first is to true up the purposes and decide on priorities—then technology can do its work." That is why NAVA calls on the nation to hold this conference.

SPECIAL LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., December 4, 1973.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Thank you for your kind invitation to Special Libraries Association to submit a statement concerning the proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, H.J. Res. 766, H.J. Res. 734, S.J. Res. 40 and related resolutions. We are pleased to respond positively to this invitation from the House Select Subcommittee on Education.

Special Libraries Association with more than 8,000 members was founded in 1909. SLA is the second largest library and information-oriented organization in the U.S.—and the third largest library association in the world. Specialized libraries serve industry, business, research, educational and technical institutions, government, newspapers, museums, and all organizations, public and private, requiring or providing specialized information.

Because many specialized libraries serve highly specialized clients, many do not have a high visibility to the general public. But they are major contributors to the economy, health and general forward progress of the nation.

Specialized libraries often depend on additional resources of university and large public libraries—but this dependence is not a one-way street because many special libraries hold unique sources of information, sometimes not even available in the National Libraries. Continuously improved and expanded library services are needed for all segments of our society. Zero funding for libraries as has been proposed by the administration must not be permitted.

In July 1973 the Association advised Senator Claiborne Pell and the members of the Senate Subcommittee on Education that SLA supported S.J. Res. 40 (93rd Congress) (Jan 26, 1973) regarding the proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

Representative Gerald R. Ford's H.J. Res. 734 (95th Congress) (Sep 19, 1973) appears to be identical with Senator Pell's S.J. Res. 40.

Comparison of your H.J. Res. 766 (Oct 17, 1973) with the other two proposed resolutions reveals a number of significant differences which, in our opinion, makes H.J. Res. 766 the preferred vehicle for enactment. Let me list some of the items in H.J. Res. 766 which improve the concept and the methods to achieve the goals:

1. The first statement of the *Preamble* significantly changes the title of the Conference from "... on Library and Information Sciences" to "... on Library and Information Services." The concept of service has been the basis of all American library operations for 200 years. SLA does not intend to minimize the emerging fields of information technology and information science. But information technology and science must be clearly focussed on the diverse needs for library and information services; to many and varied library clients in our nation, and they must be recognized as the mechanisms and theoreticians who are working toward the pragmatic goal to deliver improved services.

2. In the Resolving Clause, Subsection (b), Paragraph (2), Clause (D) of H.J. Res. 766 *very* significantly identifies the categories of participants in the Conference to be:

"representatives of Federal, State and local governments, *professional* [emphasis added] and lay people, and other members of the general public" instead of the catch-all phrase, "representatives of the general public." In this respect Special Libraries Association is firm in its belief that the professional practitioners of library service must be represented at the Conference through their appropriate professional associations.

3. In H.J. Res. 766, the concepts expressed in Subsection (c), Paragraph (3), Clauses (A) and (B) appear for the first time. In the opinion of Special Libraries Association, it is important that *all* Federal departments and agencies (including the Librarian of Congress) be *directed* (not only authorized) to cooperate and assist in all the endeavors of the proposed Conference. Each of a number of major government agencies is the only repository of government-funded research and development data.

4. Subsection (c), Paragraphs (1) and (2) are important additions. Paragraph (2) is especially important in that the selection of *all* 28 appointees is *not* assigned to the President. Without considering the animus of any individual incumbent, it is patently to be preferred that there be several appointing authorities in a matter of such national importance.

5. Subsection (b) in H.J. Res. 766 may be considered by some persons as trivial or, even worse, as a potential area of misfeasance. Knowledgeable professional workers in library and information services are constantly aware—from repeated personal experiences—of the difficulty of producing a report that is readily understood in its specifics by laymen even when well-informed laymen are convinced of the generalities. Therefore, the authorization to appropriate funds without fiscal year limitations and the continuation of the availability of such appropriated funds for obligation until expended is important.

To summarize these specific reactions to the several pending Joint Resolutions, Special Libraries Association supports the overall concept of a White House Conference in 1976, but in considering the specific terminology, it is hoped that you and the members of the House Select Committee on Education will press for the adoption of H.J. Res. 766.

May we ask for your continued patience to also consider a collateral matter? We have just seen Senate Report No. 93-521 (Calendar No. 495) as submitted by Senator Pell to accompany S.J. Res. 40. On pages 5-6 of this Report there is reproduced a Departmental Report in the form of a (July 26, 1973) addressed to Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare signed by Frank C. Carlucci, Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Special Libraries Association disagrees with Mr. Carlucci's contention that the proposed White House Conference is unjustifiable because there is

"no evidence of critical unresolved issues in libraries and information science that cannot be handled through the existing channels of communications in the field, i.e., professional associations . . ."

Mr. Carlucci seems unaware that the funds available to professional associations depend primarily on the dues paid by individual members. How can such a pittance resolve a critical national problem? If SLA were to assign its annual dues revenue solely to this *and*, we would have available about \$250,000 a year—with nothing left to pay rent, salaries, costs of journal publications, etc.

We also disagree with Mr. Carlucci's statement—

"that a White House Conference solely on the subject of libraries and information science would be too *narrowly focused* [emphasis added] . . . that these subjects should be examined as part of the broader *issue of education* [emphasis added]."

Special Libraries Association appreciates the efforts of the Bureau of Library & Learning Resources, U.S. Office of Education in HEW. But to continue to subordinate library services to those of formal educational activities is to enshrine the concepts of the 1920's and 1930's. In the existing Federal structure, the problems of education are themselves overwhelmed by the additional critical national responsibilities for health and welfare in HEW. If library and information service is critical to the nation's potential, then they must be brought to the conscious surface of both Congress and the Administration by bringing Federal responsibility for library and information services to a more prominent level than that of the Bureau of Library & Learning Resources.

Special Libraries Association does not intend to minimize the contributions of library services to the educational processes at any level from kindergartens to the universities. But the Association must emphatically underline that specialized libraries in American business, industry and research, as well as those in many "not-for-profit" organizations (museums, hospitals, social welfare and the like) and within specialized government agencies themselves, contribute to the nation's growth and development—and with relatively tenuous links to formal education processes. If Secretary Carlucci's position were to prevail, these specialized information services now funded almost solely by American industry and philanthropy would have a very minor recognition in the extremely broad concerns of HEW.

Within the past few days I have seen your Oct. 11, 1973 statement when you introduced H.J. Res. 766 in the House of Representatives. In your statement, there are a number of comments which are evidence of your real understanding of specialized library services. These comments are, in my experience, the first real recognition of the value of the specialized library and information services that are the daily duties and obligations of this Association's members at a Congressional level.

Let me list several of your statements that have particular relevance to Special Libraries Association. I list these to *emphasize the importance of these statements for the legislative record*—not to remind you of your own words:

1. "There are, in addition the libraries of hospitals and medical schools, the law libraries to which so many of my colleagues have turned in their time, the libraries of the professional and scientific societies, and the libraries of the larger business firms and trade industry organizations."

2. "... not everyone uses a library, nor does everyone use the same library throughout a lifetime of learning and work, yet the library must be there—ably staffed and well-stocked—for those who need it, when they need it. And the library cannot await a request before obtaining an item. The law library, for example, must be ready to serve its patrons even when they are not preparing for the bar examination or searching for precedents while drafting a brief." This statement is the basis for the services of special libraries; they must *anticipate* the needs of their clients.

3. "Our system of self-government requires an enlightened electorate with free access to information and opinion, and the library is as essential to the processes of self-government as the newspaper, the broadcast, the public speech or the legislative debate." SLA has a policy position, "Freedom to Communicate;" the thrust of the Association's policy statement is in total agreement with your statement regarding free access to information.

Near the conclusion of your remarks, you state that "The public library is a great and distinctively American contribution . . ." This observation is certainly correct. A less well known fact is that the concept and the establishment of special libraries is a distinctly American phenomenon which began both in the United States and in Canada, before the time of the Revolutionary War. The first special library in the U.S. was that of the Carpenter's Company of Philadelphia; it provided information for carpenters and their apprentices. At about the same time a similar special library was established in Canada in the Province of Quebec.

Special Libraries Association will be pleased to submit additional, more specific information if you wish. The Association will also welcome the opportunity to be consulted regarding appointees to the Advisory Committee for the proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

Very truly yours,

F. E. McKenna,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT BY DR. ROBERT M. HENDERSON, PRESIDENT, THE THEATRE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

In the face of the obvious explosion of recorded knowledge and information that must be retained in the Nation's archives and the increasing demands that this knowledge be made easily available to the public, libraries still essentially work with outdated techniques. They recognize the potential value of information storage and retrieval techniques, but are unable to finance the necessary application of these techniques.

The Theatre Library Association feels it is essential to coordinate the efforts of the Nation's libraries and archives in making clear their needs and in sharing the knowledge of developing techniques and programs capable of meeting these problems.

We enthusiastically endorse the joint resolution calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

STATEMENT BY HENRY E. BATES, JR., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, URBAN LIBRARY TRUSTEES COUNCIL

The Urban Library Trustees Council composed of thirty-one Metropolitan libraries, supports the House Joint Resolution 734 and 766 to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976. Since its inception the Council has strongly supported the access to information and ideas which is indispensable to the development of human potential, the advancement of civilization, and the continuance of enlightened self-government.

The Council is convinced that the growth and augmentation of the Nation's libraries and information centers are essential if all Americans are to have reasonable access to adequate services of large metropolitan public library, the urban community college, the colleges and universities, and the school libraries who all desperately need recognition and support if the population of the cities is to be educated and offered the information and cultural resources of the city. In Los Angeles, California, on January 16, 1971, John Hope Franklin, a widely respected historian, Chicago Public Library trustee, and Delegate to the Council spoke of the plight of the cities and libraries, saying:

"It is clear that the problem is that historically we have not kept up with the concentration of population; that the large cities are bearing an undue burden of educating, serving, and performing other kinds of duties for the citizenry; and that the population has rushed into the city without the agencies of government at any level taking cognizance of this concentration in terms of their budget. This is the major argument for the metropolitan libraries to be pursuing more assistance. The point is that all of these people are here and we need help to serve them." A White House Conference of Library and Information Services would alert the population at large, the local and state officials, the Congress and the President about the problems, the potential and the importance of one of the earliest still surviving uniquely American institutions.

There is an increasing tendency to ignore jurisdictional distinctions in urban areas. Students, in addition to using school and academic libraries are major users of urban public libraries. Researchers, whether academic, industrial or professional, use the library most convenient for their purposes. This places the central city library in the role of reference and research center for the outlying areas. The White House Conference would concern itself with the potential inherent in the use of advanced technology by libraries and information centers which requires cooperation through planning for, and coordination of, the services of libraries and information centers.

The District of Columbia Library with which I am associated, would lend support to the National Commission of Libraries and Information Science desire to celebrate the Centennial of the American Library Association and the Bicentennial of our country with a White House Conference on Library and Information Services. The District of Columbia Public Library, furthermore, would willingly be an example of the beginning of cooperative ventures that are so important in the further development of libraries and information centers. Regional task forces within the metropolitan Council of Governments and cooperative ventures with the local colleges and public schools as well as new methods of delivering services to communities could be examined.

As the Honorable Henry S. Reuss, U.S. Representative, 5th District Wisconsin said, "No American's future can be separated from fate of America's cities." Therefore, the Urban Library Trustees Council urges active support toward the convening of a White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

STATEMENT BY JOHN M. BRICKMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF CORRECTION

Honorable Members of the Subcommittee: On behalf of the New York City Board of Correction, it is my pleasure to submit to this distinguished Subcommittee the following statement in support of H.J. Res. 766.

Pursuant to the Charter of the City of New York, the Board of Correction is the government agency responsible for monitoring and evaluating the performance of the Department of Correction, which has operational responsibility for the ten major post-sentence and pre-trial detention facilities in New York City. In effect, the Board of Correction serves as the citizens' watchdog body over the New York City prison system.

I submit this statement in the hope that the Subcommittee will recognize that significant attention must be paid to libraries in correctional facilities and institutions throughout the United States, and with the knowledge of that for far too many years, prison libraries, like prisons generally, have at best been the subject of minimal public attention and concern.

Shortly after the violent riots that rocked the New York City prison system in the fall of 1970, the Board of Correction initiated an informal inquiry into the provision of library services to inmates.

In Fiscal Year 1970-71, the total allocation in the City budget for the purchase of materials for prison libraries was \$2,000. On December 4, 1970, the total inmate population of the New York City prisons was 13,050. On a per capita basis, this allocation was equivalent to slightly more than 15¢ per inmate.

In the same fiscal year, the total appropriation from City funds for trained library staff was \$15,600 for three library aides, at a salary of \$5,200 each per annum. Since these salaries were too meager to attract qualified personnel, the jobs went unfilled. Even if these positions had been occupied, it is highly doubtful that three persons working at subsistence-level salaries with a budget of \$2,000 could have provided even minimum standards of library service within such a vast, widely-dispersed prison system.

The picture for Fiscal Year 1971-72 was essentially unchanged; what library services that did exist in each institution were provided by a single correction officer who, however dedicated, was unskilled in library science or administration.

Based upon this inquiry, the Board of Correction committed itself to work jointly with the Department of Correction to seek markedly increased public funds and private sector support with which to provide adequate prison library services.

In Fiscal Year 1972-73 and the current fiscal year, the allocation in the City budget for prison library materials was increased to \$32,000. Coupled with a declining inmate population (8,973 on December 4, 1973), this increased appropriation has raised the per capita allocation to approximately \$3.50.

However, the provision for library staff has remained essentially unchanged. The current allocation is \$16,500 for the same three library aide positions. For the reason mentioned earlier, these jobs still remain unoccupied.

With the passage of a bill by the New York State Legislature to provide funds for the establishment and improvement of institutional libraries, \$37,267 has been allocated to the New York City public library system to provide library services to the City's prisons. These funds are to be used solely for the purchase of reading materials, and do not provide for increased library staff.

Over the past two years, immeasurable assistance in upgrading our prison libraries has been received through the Books for Prisoners Project of the Association of American Publishers. Following the compilation of a model bibliography for prison libraries, the AAP solicited 134 of its member publishing houses who voluntarily donated 1,074 new titles. As a result, 8,028 volumes, valued at over \$90,000, have been added to the shelves of eight of New York City's prison libraries. Additional contributions under the same program have been made to the Federal prison in Leavenworth, Kansas and a state institution in Chino, California.

While we are deeply appreciative of the unparalleled concern and generosity of the AAP, we cannot expect the publishers to support prison libraries volun-

farly on an ongoing basis. The initial private contributions must be expanded and institutionalized, on an annual basis, by a massive infusion of public funds.

Although we have made significant progress in improving our prison libraries over the past three years, we are still far from meeting the acceptable standards for prison library services as set forth by the American Correctional Association. Our libraries are still little more than collections of books made available to inmates for their recreational reading. While pleasure reading goes a long way toward lessening inmate tension by reducing the deleterious effects of rampant boredom and idleness, a significant percentage of our inmate population is only marginally literate or even functionally illiterate and can derive virtually no benefit from recreational reading. Therefore, the prison libraries must be viewed as more than mere repositories of books. They must play a dynamic central role in the rehabilitative program of the correctional system. Library materials, services and programs must be specifically tailored to mesh with and supplement each ongoing educational and restorative program within the prison.

Such an integration of library services and rehabilitative programs can only be achieved by professional library staff, which in the New York City prisons is currently non-existent. Public funds must be appropriated to entice qualified librarians to work within our correctional system.

Historically, prisons have languished at the bottom of the list of governmental budgetary priorities. Similarly, prison libraries are a low priority expenditure within the correctional system. Hopefully, a White House Conference on Library and Information Services would highlight the need for a reordering of our budgetary priorities and emphasize to all levels of government the desperate need for massively increased public funding for our prison library systems.

We often say that the prison walls stand as much to keep the community out as they do to keep the prisoners in. Your efforts can play a major role in the effort to open the prisons.

MICHIGAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.

November 27, 1973.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAs: We were pleased to receive a notice that the Select Education Subcommittee will hold hearings on a proposal to convene a White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services. We thought you might like to know that the Michigan Library Association, at its Fall Conference in Troy, Michigan passed the following resolution.

Whereas, there is a bipartisan proposal for a White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services in 1976, and

Whereas, the Honorable Gerald Ford of Michigan has lent his support to this proposal, therefore,

Be it resolved, that the Michigan Library Association urge the President of the United States to support legislation and funds for a 1976 White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services.

We applaud your efforts to call attention to the libraries of the country and stand ready to lend assistance in any manner you need.

Sincerely,

FRANCES H. PLETZ,
Executive Secretary.